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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of tribe</th>
<th>no. of chang-hu</th>
<th>no. of soldiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa-yeh-ku 拔野固</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P’u-ku 僕骨</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that one soldier means 3 to 6 families. So five or six thousand soldiers of the Ephthalites at the time of Sui may mean 1,500 to 3,600 families. The total population will, therefore, amount to 15,000 to 36,000, if one family consists of ten people.
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34 32 Rombunshu // Rombunshû

38 34 Library ed., // Library ed.,

// 38 p. 37 // p. 37, 55.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Records,</th>
<th>reads</th>
<th>(Records,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Tarkhan Nezak</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Tarkhan Nèzak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>文字， 禮教</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>文字禮教</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kuch-</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Kucha-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kuch-</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Kucha-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Encyclopaedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Érânahr</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Érânahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>al-Álam</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>al-Álam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Karoly</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Károly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masayoshi Nomura, Materials for the Historical Phonology of the Mongol Language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>reads</th>
<th>(reads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>henkaku〉,</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>zali-</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>zal'i-</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>*a'y::- MMo.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>or Tū</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>palatal-</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>*-r-</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>“bach.” See also § 3.2.5. Moreover</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>abd</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>tit</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>tit</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>“dans kirmağ džasu”</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>kär</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>28-39</td>
<td>yak xär</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>narge</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>)) xusu-</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>xoso....</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>nir::- niröi</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>family of language which</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>chirok”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jag.</td>
<td>reads Chag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jašr</td>
<td>Jašr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(XIX cent.)</td>
<td>(XIV cent.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tū. (36)</td>
<td>Tū.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kor. (37)</td>
<td>Kor. (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tū.</td>
<td>Tū. (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*num-</td>
<td>*num-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.1.9</td>
<td>3.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>family of language in</td>
<td>family in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*jā,</td>
<td>*ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>i(</td>
<td>i(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a~a</td>
<td>a~a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>kataia</td>
<td>kataja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>dialect</td>
<td>dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>to take</td>
<td>to have taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Mo. Ord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(§ 3.2.2.)</td>
<td>(§ 3.2.3.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>xai’i</td>
<td>xal’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(§ 3.1.1.)</td>
<td>(§ 3.1.2.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(?*iért-)</td>
<td>(?*iért-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(§ 3.1.2.)</td>
<td>(§ 3.1.3.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>&gt;:</td>
<td>-&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36–38</td>
<td>Atū. sarū, Osm. sari;</td>
<td>Atū. sarū, Osm. sari;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jap. sara-su (§ 3.1.8.)</td>
<td>Tū. *sārū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>s’jar (§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>xarā;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2nd column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39–40</td>
<td>Mo. *qil-: MMo. qil’asun~kīl’asun;</td>
<td>Mo. *qil-: MMo. qil’asun~kīl’asun;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>nynmur</td>
<td>nynmur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>“erwerben”,</td>
<td>“erwerben”,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>kirōdā</td>
<td>kirōdā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tū.: Yak.</td>
<td>Tū.: Trkm. dāš.: Yak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>444a</td>
<td>444a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>“In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>written.</td>
<td>written.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>ur. reads</td>
<td>ür reads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
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<td>bəlₚ</td>
</tr>
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<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>81</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>§ 1.3.1.2.</td>
<td>§ 1.3.1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>pp. 181,</td>
<td>pp. 81,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cag.</td>
<td>Chag.</td>
</tr>
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<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ṣājil-</td>
<td>Ṣājil-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>19</td>
<td>ṣ</td>
<td>ṣ</td>
</tr>
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<td>26</td>
<td>-re-ben</td>
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</tr>
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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'e 高車, or descendants of PA-HUA 八済, 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 cannot make clear their origin. 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 八済, a general of Ch'ê-shih 車師, is obviously based upon an arbitrary identification of the name Hua 漢, by which the Ephthalites had been known by the Chinese under the Liang 梁, with the PA-HUA 八済. 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 八済, who under (the Chinese general) Pan Yung 袁勇 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 與, no envoy came (from the country of Hua) to China......While the Yuan Wei 元魏 (or the T'o-pa Wei) had their capital at Sang-ch'ien 桑乾 (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 聚聚; but, waxing more and

(1) Wei Chieh 武知って, Si-fangchi 西蕃記 cited in the T'ung-tien 通典, Bk. 193, under I-ta-t'ung 赤瓊同. 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 黃始. But the Sung-shu 宋書, Bk. 95 (fol. 1 a), So-lü chuan 蘇略傳 writes 代都桑乾於之平城.
more powerful in the course of time, they succeeded in conquering the tribes in the neighbourhood such as Po-ssū波斯 (Sasanid Persia), Pan-p’an盤盤 (Warwälîz?), Chi-pin衞賓 (Kashmir), Yen-ch’i苑耆 (Karashar), Kuei-tsū龜茲 (Kucha), Shu-lê疏勒 (Kashgar), Ku-mê姑墨 (Aksu), Yü-tien于闐 (Khotan), and Chû-p’an於盤 (Karghalik), and expanded their territory by more than a thousand 里.\(^{[1]}\) According to the Liang-shu, five envoys 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-juí or Juan-juan蠕蠕 probably at, or in the neighbourhood of, Posterior Ch’è-shih or what is now Urumchi. About 485–486 the Kao-ch’è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’è\(^{[5]}\). Thus,

---


(2) The Annals of Liang-shu, Bk. 3, registers their embassies under the first and 7th year of P’u-t’ung (520 and 526) and the first and 7th year of Ta-t’ung (533 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七十八年矣。 文成帝 is written as 文治 in the T’ung-tien通典 as quoted in the T’ai-p’ing yü-lan太平御覽, Bk. 96 (ed. Ssu-p’u t’ung-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. Peulevskaya, Siriyskie istorichi po istorii narodov SSSR. Izv. Ak. Nauk SSSR.: Trudy Inst. Vostokoved., XLII. Moskva-Leningrad, 1941, p. 47–79, quoted by Cegledy Károly, IV–IX. századi írások zsidók a steppén, A Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, Bk. szám, Budapest 1934, p. 1). So do Armenian sources.（K. V. Trever, Kushany, chnosti i ejilchity po armeniskim istoricheskim istorii IV—VII vv., Sov. Arkeologiya, XXI, 1954, p. 143–146.）


(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 Tokharestan 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 ancestor 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 斐勇 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 CÎN Shih-chi-i 史稽顦, is probably descended from a branch of Hsiung-nu. KUAN Ying 灌嬰 of the Han fought with the Hsiung-nu and killed a cavalaryman 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-sū 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 普頭 (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 PEI Tzu-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 胡詗 is recorded in the Sung-shu 宋書, Bk. 93 (fol. 1 b), and a Hua Hêi-nu 胡黑奴 on a wall of grots of Tun-huang (謝稚 Stef. 敦煌藝術訪釘). Shanghai 1955, p. 155).

(2) 白題國, 王姓支, 名史稽顦, 其先蓋匈奴之別種胡也。漢燾與匈奴戰, 斬白題騎一人, 今在滑國東, 去滑六日行, 西限波斯, 土地出粟栗瓜葛, 食物略與滑同。普頭三年, 遣使敬方物。The family name CÎN 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: 後從撫韓信胡騎嘯下, 所將卒斬胡白題騎一人。服婿曰, 胡名也." The Han-shu reads 信 instead of 撫 and 師古 instead of 胡婿.

(4) In the Han-shu pu-shu 漢書補注, Bk. 41, WANG Hsien-ch'ien 王先謙, quoting 耦州難事詩 of Tu Fu 杜甫, wonders if po-t'i means (a Hsiung-nu with) forehead painted white.
the biography of P'ei Tzü-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 閩山道 from Po-t'ı 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) Tzü-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 項氏侯 (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 窮服 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 Tzü-yeh.

However, Hua is the name of a country, of which the king was named Yen-tai-i-li'-t'o 單帶夷栗陶 (*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 Pos-su (Persia) is situated to the west of Hua: K'ıo-pan-t'o 湯盤陶 (Tashkurgan) to the east of Hua: and Chou-ku-ko 周古柯 (Karghali), Ho-po-t'an 何波囂 (Kabādīyān), and Hu-mi-tan 胡蜜丹 (Kumēdh in Wakhān) are in the neighbourhood of Hua. From these statements we can guess that Hua existed somewhere in the neighbourhood of the middle of the Oxus. O. Franke and Marquart, reading Hua as Wart and Oat respectively,[3] take it as transcribing Warz, an Ephthalite

---

(1) 蛮, 西北微外, 有白題及滑國. 派使由侯氐道入賞, 此二國歲代奉歲, 莫知所出. (索)子野曰, 項氏侯自胡白題國入, 華題同名也, 又序之龍鳴, 有八滑, 從之. 此其後乎? 時人服其博識, 景乃使常方國使, 景題恊盛之盛. 自更服至於著表. 凡二十四, Liang-shu, Bk. 30 (= Nan-shih 受史, 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 Pos-su 波斯 (Sasanid Persia) descended from King Pos-su-ni 被斯匿, * Pasenig for Pasenadhi, Prasenajit, who ruled at Sravasti 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, which was the Chih-kung-t'u 使貢圖 by Emperor Yuan-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. Shratort, Settikshi Kenkyü 西域史研究 II, Tokio 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 Húa, xión, etc. is no longer tenable. Now, see M. Busagl, 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 Warwaliz 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, *t*\(w\) at represents *Ghwār* > *Ghōr* which is to be located on the upper waters of Hari Rūd. I can not locate exactly Hua as no detailed report has so far been available concerning the geography and archaeology of this region, but Ghōr, 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-chéng 活路城 which was the centre of communities of the Ephthalites.\(2\) This Huo-lu will also represent Ghōr or Ghūr, as has been suggested by Chavannes,\(3\) or it may be a transcription of Hari Rūd, if this name had already existed at the time.

(1) O. Franke, Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, III, Berlin-Leipzig 1937 p. 312; J. Markwart, Wehot and Arang, Leiden, 1938, p. 45. Warz (?) being an Ephthalite king who was killed by Sinjībū Khakān 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, Tōdai no Hatsurinkoku ni kan suru ichi mondai 唐代の都督府に関する一問題 (A study of Fu-lin-huo during the T’ang), Kiwa Aṣīa Gakushū 北亜細亜学報, II, pp. 225–233. The location of the country of Hua is a bit complicated question as Hua 滑 (*t*\(w\) at) is very similar to Huo 活 (*t*\(w\)āt) of Hsiao-ch山坡 (Records, Bk. 1, p. 27; Bk. 12, p. 6–7, ed. Kyoto University) in its reading. However, Hua of Hsiao-ch山坡 is to be located at Warwaliz to the north of what is now Kunduz, because Hsiao-ch山坡 writes that from Huo one can reach K’ou-hai-to 関倉多 (Khost) and An-ta-lo-fo 安燈羅縰 (Andarab) in the south-east and Fu-ch’iē-lang 紅伽陵 (Baghlan) Bk. 1, p. 27) in the south-west, which shows that Huo cannot be Ghōr on the upper reaches of Hari Rūd or the region of Chor or Ghori to the south of Baghlan. Moreover, the Liang-shu, Bk. 54, does not mention the Buddhism at Huo 滑, while Hsiao-ch山坡 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 Hsiao-ch山坡 is the same as A-huan-chéng 阿速城 (with several variants), where the T‘ieh-shih Tu-tu-fu 月氏都督府 was established for the reason that it was the centre of Tokhārastān. The T‘ieh-shih Tu-tu-fu was governed by a Turkish yabgu and it put the area of Balkh and Badakhşān under its control, Fu-ch’iē (for *t*\(w\) at) – chéng 紅伽陵 or Bakhdi and Pa-tē-shah-chéng 抹特山城 or Badakhšān being the location of government of Ta-li-sia-chou 大夏州 and Fan-t‘ang (yuan?) - chou 范陽 (陽?)州 under the Tu-tu-fu. Under the T’ang, T’u-hou-lo 吐火羅 means the whole of Tokhārastān on one hand and A-huan-chéng, its centre, on the other. Nothing is mentioned about the Ephthalites in relation to Huo 活 or T‘ieh-shih Tu-tu-fu, though the inhabitants of Tokhārastān 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 other sources. Marquart and Herrmann locate the Ta-han Tu-tu-fu in the present Badakhshān and to the east of it respectively, where Sung-yun saw the king and queen of the Ephthalites in 519 (Marquart, Wehot and Arang, p. 46–48 note; Herrmann, Asia Major, II, p. 576.) But, this location is untenable as Badakhshān was under the T‘ieh-shih Tu-tu-fu. Marquart (Ergebn., p. 65) followed by J. Walker, A catalogue of the Arab-Sasanian coins, 1941. p. IX says that the Ephthalites penetrated by force of arms as far as Badghis and Herât in 578. It is afraid that here he is mistaking the Khakhān of Turks of Ţabarā (I, p. 991 ed. De Goede: Nöldke, p. 269) as the king of the Ephthalites.

(3) Documents sur les Thou-kiûe (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. For some reason unknown to us, Hua was received as, or pretended to be, the Ephthalite empire itself. That the envoy of Hua told the Liang that their king was named Yen-tai-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, Kumêd 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, 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. This coincides with the statement of the biography of Pei Tzu-yeh that the envoy of Hua came via Min-shan-tao 山道 or the road by the Min-shan Mountains in Ssû-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 Pei Tzu-yeh.

(2) The K’ang-chü 唐居 theory

The second theory which can easily be ruled out is the K’ang-chü theory which looks upon the Ephthalites as descendants of K’ang-chü. Wei Chieh 華節 says in the Hsi-fan-chi 西蕃記 as follows: “I had a personal talk with some Ephthalites and knew that they also called themselves I-t’ien 倫屬. In the Han-shu 漢書 it is stated that the viceroy of K’ang-chü, named I-t’ien 倫屬, plund-

---

(2) Gorgo (Γεγρός) is usually identified with Gurcan in ancient Hircania. But it may be Gorga (Γεγρα) of Procopus (F. H. C., IV, p. 106, frag. 33), an operation base of Yazdegerd and Perzâx against the Kidarites, that is to be identified with Gurcan.
(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-kins occidentaux, p. 375 under Wei Tseih: A. Herrmann, in Asia Major, II, 1925, p. 579–580.
ered provisions and arms under Ch'én T'ang 陳湯 who marched against Chih-chih (Shan-yü) 鄙文 (單于). This may mean that they are descendants of K'ang-chhū. 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 楊帝 of Sui (605–616), who sent him to western countries. The Hsi-fān-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 忿鬱 (*ipe-t'ien) is a Chinese transcription of a name of Ephthalites, which is also written as I-ta 忿鬱 (*ipe-tā) (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-chhū in the Former Han, but, as he himself confesses, there is no solid ground for this combination except the resemblance of name. (3)

(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 陝書, 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:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Wei-shu (the original Hsi-yü-chuan)} & \quad \text{Pei-shih (Hsi-yü-chuan)} > \text{Wei-shu} \\
\text{Chou-shu (J-yü-chuan 異域傳)} & \quad \text{(the present Hsi-yü-chuan)} \\
\text{Sui-shu (Hsi-yü-chuan 西域傳)} & \quad \text{
}
\end{align*}\]

(1) 又史籍西蕃記云，親問其國人，並自稱怨鬱，又被漢書，陳湯征鄯支，康居副王怨鬱，抄其後夏，此或康居之種類。然傳自異國，夷語詭舛，年代絶微，莫知根貫，不可得而諷也，etc. (通典，Bk. 193). In every edition now available of Han-shu, Bk. 70 (Biography of Ch'én T'ang), I-t'ien 忿鬱 is written I-pao 忿鬱.

(2) Concerning the name of the Ephthalites in Chinese sources, see Herrmann, Asia Major, 11, p. 572. It seems that I-t'ien 忿鬱 was adapted by Wei Chieh and I-t'a 忿鬱 by Pei Chü 傳記 (See his preface to the Hsi-yü ch'ü-chi 西域傳記 in the Sui-shu, Bk. 67, fol. 36). Also see Pelliot in JA, 1920 (1), p. 143 note 1 on the phonetic value of 忿鬱.

(3) Yang, Lien-sheng, Topics in Chinese History (Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies, IV), Cambridge, 1930, p. 34. As for the patching up of lost chapters, see the Tōyō Gakuhō 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

周書卷五

隋書卷八十三

倭 咸 國

倭 咸 國

1. 大月氏之種類也.
2. 亦曰高車之別種.
3. 原出於塞北，自金山而南.
4. 在于闐之西.
5. 都烏渓水南二百餘里.
6. 去長安一萬一百里.
7. 其王都拔底延域，蓋王舍城也.
8. 其城方十里餘.
9. 多寺塔，皆飾以金.
10. 風俗與突厥略同.
11. 其俗兄弟共一妻.
12. 無兄弟者，戴一角帽.
13. 若有兄弟者，依其多少之數，更加帽焉.
14. 衣服類加以纏絡，頭皆剪髪.
15. 其語與蠕蠕高車及諸胡不同.
16. 衆可有十萬.
17. 無城邑，依隨水草。以氈為屋，夏遙涼土，冬逐暖處.
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。多駿馬.

3. 膤兵者五六千人.

(1) The comparison has been made by A. Herrmann, Die Hethotaliten und ihre Beziehungen zu China, Asia Major, II, 1925, pp. 566–571 and K. Funak, 胶木勝馬, Ehatsari ni kansuru Chūgoku shiryō ni tsuite (Chinese sources concerning the Ephthalites), Shien 10, 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，私盗無多少，皆元斬。盗一責十。
22. 死者當家無石為藏，貧者掘地而埋，隨身諸物，皆置墳內。
23. 其人因暫，能戰備。
24. 該小國三十許，皆役屬之。餘國，皆役屬之。
25. 之為大國。
26. 與垂堯婚姻。
27. 自大安以後，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，朝貢遂絕。
28. 初熙平中，明帝遣陸伏子統領雲沙門法力等，使西城，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。盖舉其略云。
29. 至大統十二年，遣使獻其方物。
30. 景帝二年，周明帝二年，並遣使來獻。
31. 吏為突厥所破，部落分散，職貢遂絕。
32. 至隋大業中，又遣使朝貢方物。
33. 其國去漠北千里五，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 envoys from the Ephthalites, says that after Yung-hsi 永熙 (533–534) of Wu-t'ī 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*.\(^{13}\) *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 涇槃陀 (Tashkurgan) and other countries, which are extracted from Sung-yün 宋雲, which follow the statement concerning the Ephthalites.

It is certain that *Pei-shih* 6 was taken from *Chou-shu* 3 because Ch’ang-an was the capital of Chou, and not of Wei.\(^{12}\) *Pei-shih* 7–9 have also copied *Chou-shu* 4–5\(^{13}\) 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.\(^{43}\)

As for the rest of *Pei-shih*, 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-shih* 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 the *Chou-shu*.\(^{63}\) It is because the *Chou-shu* describes the Ephthalites after Khotan, hence this indication makes sense. I am also of the opinion that *Pei-shih* 5, which informs of the location of the Ephthalite capital, has copied the *Sui-shu* 1,\(^{63}\) 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-shih* 23 may be a repetition of *Chou-shu* 10. But, *Pei-shih* 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 Guán Chung-mien 桑仲敏, 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-wén Ts’ê 宇文謝 (*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, Tokhārestān and Gandhāra. And in the 5th and the 6th centuries (Ta-)-yüeh-shih usually meant the territory on both sides of the Hindūkush Mountains. 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 Kidarites who were called Ta-yüeh-shih under the Wei. The Kidarites dominated Tokhārestān and Gandhāra until they were conquered by the Ephthalites. The resemblance of the name Yen-ta to Yüeh-shih would have encouraged the identification.

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

---


2. Funaki, op. cit., p. 60, holds the latter view. The Chou-shu, Bk. 54 (fol. 3b), identifies Po-ssō 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 Kidarites unified Tokhārestān and Gandhāra some time between 412 and 437. But the Ephthalites deprived them of Tokhārestān at the middle of the 5th century and Gandhāra some time between 477 and 520. See K. Enoki, On the date of the Kidarites, Tōkyō Gaku-hō, XLI, 1958, p. 283–334.

4. Here is a list of main articles:

---


of Pei-shih, Chou-shu, and Sui-shu, but also tried to establish the phonetical identity of the name of Yüeh-shih 月氏 and Yen-ta 嚇薩. For instance, Fujita Toyo-
hachi 藤田豐八 says that Yüeh-shih is a transcription of Ghattal 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-li 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 con-
troversy 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 in-
dependent from the Juan-juan 路縫 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 Kidárites.)
—Do., Datén no Kisan-jô to Giesshi to doji 大宛の費山城と月氏の王庭 (Tōshi Kōshishi no
Kenkyū, Seiki-hen 東西交渉史の研究, 西域篇, p. 38–39).
—Do., Giesshi no kachi to sono sei no rendai 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, J.R.A.S., X, 1878,
—St. Martin, V. de., Les Huns Blancs ou Ephthalites, Paris 1849, p. 64
—Do., Mémoire analytique sur la carte de l'Asie centrale et de l'Inde (Mémoire sur les contrées occiden-
tales, II, Paris 1858, p. 200–206) (He insists that the Ephthalites were Tibetans.)
—Do., Po sledam drevnhorezniskoj civilizatsii, Moskva-Leningrad 1948 p. 211 (See L.
Petrich'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-chê 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-chêng 平城\(^5\). And it was not until some time after 490, when the Ephthalites conquered the Kao-chê 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-chê 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-chê, while it is recognized that the language of the Ephthalites was different from that of Juan-juan 鞣靼, Kao-chê 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-chê. Chou-shu 6, says that penalties and manners and customs among the Ephthalites are almost the same as among the T’u-chûeh 突厥, of which the Kao-chê was a kindred tribe. It was not the Ephthalites but the Kao-chê 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 Chê-shih 車師, others say it is a branch of the Kao-chê 高車, and still others say it is a branch of the Ta-yüeh-shih 大月氏.”\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) 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-chih 西國志, is given in the Fa-yüan-chu-lin 法苑珠林, Bk. 100 and 5 (Tripiṭaka Taishō LIII, p. 1024 a–b, 310b). On this book, see S. JULIEN, Mêlanges de géographie asiatique, etc., Paris, 1864, p. 203: F. HIRTZ, 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 Hutṣirin-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.  
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 似乍 is of the race of Ta-yüeh-shih in the time of Han 漢. The Ta-yüeh-shih 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'eng 藍氏城. Ta-hsia is nothing but T'u-ho-lo 吐呼羅 (Tokhāres-tân). Yen-ta 延陀 is their king's family name. The descendants made the family name (the name of) the country, which corrupted into I-ta 似乍. It is also called I-t'ien 似顕. 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."(3) 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,(4) 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.(5) He also copied the Liang-tien 梁典 of Lu 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 cannot 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-kiu 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 Lu 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 Liang Fan and his son in the Chou-shu, Bk. 42, fol. 4a–b: Ėrh-shih-wei-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: "滑壇姓源出，後裔以姓為國號，轉譯又謂之勃客匈 " (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'ang-tien 通典, Bk. 193 under I-ta-t'ung 拓恒同).
(5) Chou-shu 6 (see p. 8).
(6) According to the T'ai-fu yüan-kuei 前唐元書, I-ta 拓達 sent an envoy in the 6th year of K'ai-yüan 貞元 (718) and I-ta 拓恒 in the 7th month of the 7th year of T'ien-pao 天寶 (748) and I-heng 拓恒 (for I-ta 拓恒) in the 6th month of the same year (前唐元書臣部 史部 (p. 648)). 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 Haietelah or Ephthalites. Then Asseman 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 connection 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-le 微勒 of water. The T'ieh-le 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, 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), Kingsmill (1878), Richthofen (1879) and some others. 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 sasanides (Le Musion, 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 indications 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 suppress 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.
(6) See p. 11 Note (4).
peoples” (p. 74–75). And, following Specht, he concluded that the Ephthalites were a branch of the Ta-yüeh-shih. However, as I have explained in the preceding 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. But, Cunningham’s opinion, starting with grave misunderstanding that the Ephthalites were nothing but the Juan-juan 蜘蝟, could be ignored nowadays so far as the origin of the Ephthalites is concerned, 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 ὄσπροι) 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 ὄσπροι 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 Yasodharman, and this Hûṇa refers to the Ephthalites, and the inscription on the monument for the victory of King Yasodharman 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.


(3) See the criticism by Isoki Miyazaki in Seiyû Gakuô 背丘學範, 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 Jaůvla, the title of Toramána 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 “Indica” writes of “Turkish King’s rule over Kábul during the invasion of the Islam forces after 664, and that Wu-k'ung 惠空 mentions the rule of the T'u-chüeh 突厥 over Gandhāra and Kábul 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 Jaůvla means a hawk, and Taramána (tūramūn, toremen,) means rebellion or rebel, but the Turkish language has no such words meaning hawk and rebellion respectively. The meaning of Jaůvla 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'i 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 Mihrikula and Toramána were Hūṇa.(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.(3) 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 Śvēta Hūṇa and Hára Hūṇa in the Indian documents and taking Hára as Qara, the Turkish or Mongolian word which means “black”,(3) explains that Hára Hūṇa

---

(1) K. G. Sankar, The Hun Invasion of Hindustan, New Indian Antiquity, IV, 36–43. K. Enoki, The date of the Kidârîtes, Tôyô Gakubô, LXI, p. 299–300 is of the opinion that Skandagupta fought with Kidârîtes which were called Hūṇas by the Indian.


must be Qara Qūn, and Sveta Huṇa should have been originally called Čaɣan Qūn or White Qūn, and the place name Čaɣaniyān in Tokhārestān came from the occupation of the place by the Ephthalites, and as Čaɣan means white in Mongolian, the Ephthalites were a Mongol tribe and this is also a proof that the northern tribes were extensively called Qūn. On this view of Marquart's, several criticisms have appeared. Here is a leap in argument which makes it difficult for us to follow. Marquart, identifying Huaa 满, another Chinese name for the Ephthalites, as the transliteration of обще of Ṭhaṇāwizw which is considered the real name of Avars who invaded Europe, and also identifying Huo-kuo 活國 in the Records of Hsuan-chwang and A-huan-ch'eng 阿緩城 in the T'ang-shu 唐書 as the same name and, connecting it with Warwäliz in the neighborhood of Kunduz in Tokhārestān and further identifying обще as identical with the Hun 满, a branch of the Kao-ch'ê 高車, interprets Ṭhaṇāwizw as the inhabitants on the banks of the Orkhon (Warxon) River. 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"; "de race mongole comme le Jouan-juooan"; and also "proto-mongols"; "the Avars must have been the Ephthalites" or "обще (Avars) must be the Ephthalites who migrated to the West". In A. Herrmann's Atlas of China, Cambridge, Mass., 1935, p. 30, Huua 满 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 Huua 满. Huua is not the name of tribe, but the name of country.

3. See p. 5, note (2); p. 32 ff.
7. R. Grousset, L'empire mongol, Paris, 1941, p. 2: L. Peuch, Asia centrale in Civilità dell'Oriente, Sérise, Roma, 1956, p. 932, also writes that "it seems that their (Ephthalites') ruling class was proto-turk or proto-mongol".
9. Ibid., p. 127.
10. L. Ligeti is of the opinion that 满 Huua, *ruud represents war (see C. Károlyi, IV-IX, szézadi népmozgalmajak a steppei, Budapest, 1954, p. 8). I think he is right in this point, but it is a mistake to look upon this war as a transcription of Ṭhaṇ (k'ar Xarla) which is a name of tribe, as Czeholov has elaborated. (op. cit., p. 8-11).
On the Nationality of the Ephthalites

(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, Shunshō Shigematsu 重松俊章 published in 1917 "Ehutaru shuzoku kō 喻訶種族考 (A Study of the Ethnology of the Ephthalites)", Shigaku Zasshi 史學雑誌, 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 Ṭabarī as Turk; (2) The ruler of the Ephthalites who had their headquarters in Gandhāra is called tê-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 Tāranātha, in the days of Asanga and Vasubandhu, the founders of Mahāyāna Buddhism, there was a Turkish king named Mahāsammata in Kashmir who, occupying Tokhāra and Gaznī, 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 建陀 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 宮崎吾朗 published a lengthy article in Seikyū Gakushō 青丘學叢 (Nos. 4, 6, 21, 1931–1935) entitled "Ehutaru shuzoku no hatten 喻訶種族の進展 (The development of the Ephthalites)", in which he proves 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 Chins-shan 金山 area proves that they were a Turkish tribe.

Now, even though Shigematsu rightly points out that (2) Tê-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 tribē on that strength. Moreover, how much authenticity could be accepted in the history of Buddhism of Tāranātha, 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 Gandhāra is on p. 107. Tê-ch'in is written as tê-chê 特勒 in the Pei-shih (Wei-shu). Concerning the tê-ch'in and tê-chê question in Chinese records, see Chang Yu-an-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 Ţabarî, the Khâkân, king of the Turks, invaded the territory of Persia at the time of BAHÂM GûR (420–438) with 250,000 Turks, but he was finally destroyed by BAHÂM GûR who deprived of him his dominion which had belonged to the Turks. BAHÂM 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. Ţabarî wrote that BAHÂM GûR appointed his brother Narsû the governor of Khorâsân at Balkh (to meet the new situation after the conquest). It is generally known that Ţabarî is based on Arabic translations of the Khodâînâmê, a semi-official history of Sasanid Persia compiled under the reign of Khosrû I (531–578) and his successors up to YazdegirD III (632–651/652) and the Khodâînâmê itself and its Arabic translations have long been lost. So it is impossible to know what was the original statement of the Khodâînâmê in connection with the Turkish Khâkân who invaded Persia under BAHÂM GûR. But the same event is recorded by Mas'ûDî who tells us that Khâkân, king of the Turks, invaded Soghd and trespassed the territory of BAHÂM GûR as far as Rey, but BAHÂM conquered him. On the other hand, Firdûsî says that, at the time of BAHÂM GûR, the Khâkân of Chin invaded his territory, but he was defeated at Kashmihan, near Merv; BAHÂM, taking advantage of this, conquered countries in Sogdiana and established a pole with cement and stone at Fârâb on the north of Jihûn (Syr) and established a boundary-line between the Jîhûn and such countries as Irân, Khalaj and Turkestân, which he ordered not to be trespassed unless the imperial order of the Persian king. Firdûsî describes in full


(2) According to the Persian Ţabarî (ZOTENBERG, Chronique de Tabari, II, p. 12), the version adapted from the original Arabic by BAL'AM 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 Khodâînâmê (Khodâînâmak), see A. CHRISTENSEN, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, 2nd ed., Copenhagen, 1944, p. 59ff. I could not get access to V. R. ROSEN, K soprom ob arakhisîkîh perevodakh Khodâî-name, Vostockiûa Zanetki, Saint-Petersburg, 1895 (cf. S. INOSTRAANTS'IY, Sassanidski studii, SPb., 1908, p. 85).

(6) Prairie d'or, II, p. 190.
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the fighting between the Persian king and the Khâkân of Čin. It must be noticed that Firdūsī is much more detailed than Masʿūdī who is more factually concrete than Ṭabarī. This shows that, as time went on, more details were added to the tradition concerning the invasion of Turkish Khâkân at the time of Bahram Gûr. And it seems that the Khâkân was considered, as in Masʿūdī, to have come down via Sogdiana on the ground that the Khâkân of T'u-chüeh 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 Turkestan at the middle of the 7th century\(^2\) that Firdūsī writes that the Khâkân of Čin, 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 Bahram Gûr,\(^3\) and it was not until 546 that the T'u-chüeh became independent from the Juan-juan, 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 Bahram Gûr. If the Khâkân of Turks had been mentioned in the Khodâinâmé, 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, Ṭabarī himself distinguishes the Turks from the Ephthalites (Haitâl). He writes that the gate constructed by Bahram Gûr as boundary-mark between the Persian and Turkish territory was removed in the land of Turks at the time of Pêrož (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 Pêrož marched against Akhsunwâr,\(^6\) king of the Ephthalites, as far as the gate which was set up by Bahram Gûr as boundary-mark between Khûrásân and the country of the Turks. This means that Ṭabarī distinguished the so-called Turks from the Ephthalites. I, therefore, am of the opinion that the Turks who invaded Persia at the time of Bahram 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

---

(3) See on p. 10, note 4.
(4) Tôôrikishi Daigiten 東洋歴史大辭典, VI, p. 353c.
(5) Nöldke, op. cit., p. 102.
north-west of Persia was generally called Turks\(^1\); that in the \textit{Shāhnāmē} the name Turk means something like Turān 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 Bahrām Gūr, the Kidārites just unified or were unifying Tokhārestān and Gandhāra\(^4\) and the Un-na-sha 温那沙 or Chionites ruled in Sogdiana.\(^5\) So it may be either the Kidārites or the Un-na-sha that invaded the territory of Persia.\(^6\) In any way, the Khākān of Turks in Ṭabarî should have been a chief of some other tribe than the Ephthalites.

Neither the account in the \textit{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 Mryazaki 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 \textit{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


\(^6\) J. Markwart, \textit{A catalogue of the provincial capitals of Ėrânshahr}, edited by G. Mesina (\textit{Analecta Orientalia}, 3), Roma, 1931, p. 43 is of the opinion that the Turkish king killed by Bahrām Gūr 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 楚密 (*Nok-ṃēthān, Bukhara) 23720 里 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 楚密 and Hu-shih-mi 呼支密 (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 is 22,828 里. As Hsi-wan-chin is situated at the distance of 12,720 里 from Tai, Niu-mi is 10,108 里 off Samarkand. In the same way, it is calculated that A-fu-t'ai-han is 892 里 distant from Niu-mi and Hu-shih-mi (Khorazm?) 980 里 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, \textit{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 \textit{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‘ē. 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 hafa or hafat as a combination of hafa or hafat and -l. I have not yet come across the word hafta or hafat as a name of the Ephthalites.\(^{1}\) On the contrary, ‘Ephthalic’ of Theophanes and Yen-tai-li-li-to 駱駝曳曳陌(2) of the Liang-shu may be explained as a combination of Eftal or *Yeptal and -tæ or -tæae 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 “Eftarum no Jinshu ni tsuite 仏塔ル人の種について (On the Ethnology of the Ephthalites)”, and at the general meeting of the Tōyōshi Kenkyūkai (Society of Oriental History), Kyōto University, in November, 1950, I presented my view in an address entitled “Eftarum Minzoku ni okeru Iran-tekijōso 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 Tokhārestān 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 “Eftarum Minzoku no

\(^{1}\) As for variants of the name, see Cseglely Károly, IV–IX. századi népmozgalmak a stepén, Budapest, 1954, p. 4–5. F. W. Haussig interprets that hafa or hafat means “seven” in Middle Persian and that it is the title of king who called himself “der Grosse Herr der sieben Geschlechter und der Gebiete über die sieben Klimata der Welt” (p. 223, 319, 324–325). However, the title of Grosser Herr, etc. is that of the Qāyān of T‘u-chieh as Thephylact states (Haussig, p. 282, 6–8; 286) and there is no evidence that it was used by the Ephthalites.

\(^{2}\) Or Eftali or *Yeptali and -tæe or -tæe. 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. Moravsk, Byzantinoticca, II, Budapest 1943 p. 47.

\(^{3}\) This may be for Yen-tai-li-li-to 駱駝曳曳陌

\(^{4}\) According to Kātib al-Khuḍūrī and Isma‘il al-Jāhrī al-Jāhrī, Khallukh (Qarluq) is recorded as one of the Ephthalite tribes in Badakhshān. But, I am not in the position to analyze why and how the Qarluq in Tokhārestān was connected with the Ephthalites. See H. Hoffmann, Die Qarluq in der tibetischen Literatur, Oriens, 5, p. 200–201.
Kigen (The Origin of the Ephthalites) in the Wada Hakushi Kanreki-kinen Toyoshi Ronsō, 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 Tokhārestān and pressed the Kidārītes 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. 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 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‘ū 海曲 or Sea-bend, (i.e. Sogdiana, Khōrasān, Persia and countries on the eastern and northern coast of the Mediterranean Sea), (3) the region to the south of Chē-shē 者舌 (Tashkent) and to the north of Yūeh-shih 月氏 (Tokhārestān), (i.e. the Tashkent-Tokhārestān 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). Thirteen of these sixteen countries were Kuitzū 龜兹 (Kucha), Su-lē 疏勒 (Kāshgar), Wu-sun 烏孫, Yūeh-pan 悦盤, K‘o-pan-t‘o 湯槃陀 (Tashkurgan) Shan-shan 紙善, Yen-ch‘i 焉耆 (Karashar), Chē-shih 車師 (Turfan), Su-t‘e 某特 (Sogdiana), Po-lo-na 破洛那 (Fārghāna), Chē-shē 者舌 (Tashkent), Ta-ch‘in 大秦, and Yūeh-shih 月氏 (Tokhārestān), and the other three may have been Chē-i 車逸, Hsi-chü-pan 惟居胡 (Karghalik), and Po-ssū 波斯 (Persia). It must be noted that nothing was known about the Ephthalites in 437.

At the time, Su-t‘e 某特 or Sogdiana, which was also called Wên-na-sha 湿那沙 or (H)ün-na-shā "king of the Huns", was under the rule of king

---

(1) 大安二年十有十月（Dec. 13/14, 456—Jan. 11, 457）, 習業善風國並遊波朝鞠（Wei-shu, Bk. 5, fol. 2a).
(2) As for the compilation of Hsi-yü-chuan of Wei-shu, see Tōyō Gakuhō, XXXVII, 4, p. 430–444.
(3) Concerning the location of these four regions, see Tōyō Gakuhō, XXXVII, 4, p. 437ff.
Hu-tai, 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 Tokharestan, which was called Yüeh-shih月氏 or Ta-yüeh-shih大月氏, the Kidarites were prosperous and they had already extended their territory as far as Gandhara.\(^2\) Under the circumstances, the Ephthalites had not appeared in Sogdiana and Tokharestan until 437, but at the middle of the 5th century they were active and powerful in Tokharestan. Tabari informs us that Përôz, 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 Përôt fled must have been Tokharestan 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 their 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-chê高垂 had just accomplished their independence from the Juan-juan建歸, and then the Ephthalites put Kao-ch'ang高昌 (Turfan) and Yen-ch'i燕耆 (Karashar) under their control. They killed Ch'iung-ch'i窮奇, chief of the southern Kao-chê, and attacked the northern Kao-chê to force them to accept Mi-ê-t'u米俄突, who was the son of Ch'iung-ch'i and had been under their protection, as their king.\(^4\) In 522, Po-lo-mên坡羅門, a Juan-juan


\[2\] K. Enoki, Kidêra-chê no nendai ni isutteキーダーラ朝の時代について (On the date of the Kidarites), Tôyô Gakushô, XLII, p. 289ff.


\[4\] The exact date of the first Ephthalite invasion of Kao-chê 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-chê's independence in the 14th year of Tai-ho太和 (490), whereas they sent a mission to inspect the situation under the leadership of Yu-t'ê于提. Yu-t'ê returned to the Wei, accompanied by Kao-chê's embassy named Po-chên波漸, and again went to Kao-chê together with Ch'ou Chang-shêng朱長生, who was also named Ho-tsu-hun霍素昆. After they interned there for three years (Wei-shu, BK. 98, fol. 7b: Wei-shu, BK. 103, fol. 7a). So we gather from these events that the first Ephthalite invasion of Kao-chê took place at least three years later than 490, i.e. 493. A-fu-chên-alô 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-yên彭利延, one of his tribe's men. More than one year later, the Ephthalites again invaded Kao-chê, which resulted in the enthronement of Mi-ê-t'u in place of Po-li-yên (Ibid.). On the other hand, in the 1st year of Yung-p'îng永平 (508), Po-t'urei杜圍, khayan of Juan-juan, attacked Kao-chê 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 Tsch-lo 騰羅 in the south, Ch’ih-lê 勒勒 (i.e. Kao-ch’ê) in the north, Yü-t’ien 于闐 (Khotan) in the east and Po-su 所思 (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-su 所思 (Persia), Pan-p’an 切盤 (Warwâliz?), Chi-pin 闢賓 (Kashmir), Yen-ch’i 永耆 (Karashar), Kuei-tsû 龟茲 (Kucha),

wu 宣武 (Biid), which may have been the envoy recorded in the Annals of Wei under 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’r’u and the enthronement of Mu-’r’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 Ts’ai-dhê l’ung-chien 裡治通鑣, Bk. 104 under the 7th year of Tien-chien 天監.

It is also not clear when the Ephthalites put Kao-ch’ang 高昌 and Yen-ch’i 永耆 under their control. Kao-ch’ang was subjugated to Kao-ch’ê when Kao-ch’ê killed Fu’r’u of Juan-juan in 506 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’u Chia 鄭嘉, 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), Ch’u 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-shih, 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 斯紇 or Hsiao-wu 宣武, emperor of Wei, said to an embassy of Mu-’r’u 麪俄突, 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 influential in Kao-ch’ang.

\(^{1}\) Hsi-hai-ch’ün 西海郡 was located at Chi-yen 居延 or near what is now Khara-khoto. As for the location and importance of this region, see Pei-shih, Bk. 98 (fol. 4b)= Wei-shu, Bk. 103 (fol. 4b) and the biography of Yüan Fan 袁範 (Wei-shu, Bk. 69, fol. 5b-6a=Pei-shih, Bk. 47, fol. 2a). Yüan Fan, governor of Liang-chou 濟州 at the time, initiated to place Po-lo-men there when Po-lo-men came to Liang-chou to ask for protection for fear of attack of I-fu 伊匐, brother of Mu-’r’u 麪俄突 who was killed by Juan-juan (Pei-shih, Bk. 98, fol. 8a= Wei-shu, Bk. 103, fol. 7a). It was in the 2nd month of Chêng-kuang 正光 (501) (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 周顥譔, 洛陽伽蓝記校釋, p. 100.
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Su-lê 疏勒 (Kâshgar), Ku-mê 姑墨 (Aksu), Yü-t'ien 子園 (Khotan), and Chü-p'an 句盤 (Karghalik) and extended their territory by more than a thousand ǐ. 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 恤萬斤 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 privileged 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 Gandhára between 477 and 520. In 477 the Kidârites (in Gandhára) sent the last embassy to the court of T'o-pa Wei\(^2\) and in 520 when Sung-yünn visited Gandhára 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 Tokhaïrestân by the middle of the 5th century and then extended their territory as far as the T'ien-shan = Yen-ch'i area and Gandhára, 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 Tokhaïrestân and Chaghânian (in Transoxiana).\(^4\) Then, in which part of Tokhaïrestân originated the Ephthalites? In

---

\(^1\) K. Enoki, The origin of the White Huns or Ephthalites, East and West, VI, 3, 1955, p. 233-234.

\(^2\) 太和元年 (477) 九月，東道及西天竺，舍略·懸伏羅諸國，各遣使者貢 (Wei-shu, Bk. 7a, fol. 3b). On this, see Tōyō Gakuhō, XLI, 3, p. 320, 328.

\(^3\) 週顧遠, 洛陽伽藍記校錄, p. 107.

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

(1) Ghôr (Ghôr)

As I have explained in the first chapter, it is under the country of Hua 滑 (*tʰʷaṭ) that the Liang-shu (Bk. 54, fol. 8b-9a) describes the Ephthalites. Hua is situated to the west of Po-ṭi 白麴 at the distance of six days' journey. As Po-ṭi (*bʰok-d'ići) is undoubtedly a transcription of Bakhchis, Hua must be situated in the region to the west of Bakhchis, which I have located at Ghôr in the upper reaches of the Hari Rūd 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-ṣū 波斯 (Persia) and Mo 末 or Marw adjoins Hua in the east respectively. (2) This Hua is identical with Huo-ṇu (*tʰʷāṭ-ḷu) 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 Bamiyân (Map of Kâbul, 2nd ed. published by War Office, 1944). G. Jarrige 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……東罽猘國……接 (Liang-shu, Bk. 54, fol. 9b). 波斯, 漢譯且未必也,……北冼丁零, 東罽白麴. 西罽白麴接 (Ibid.). The Liang-shu mistakes Mo 末 for Ch'êh-mo 亦末 during the Han 廣. But, adjoining Po-ṣū in the west and Po-ṭi 白麴 (Bakhchis) in the east, it should be identified with Marw. The statement of the Liang-shu that Mo adjoins Ting-ling 丁零 or Kao-chê 高漞 in the north is based on the misunderstanding that Mo was located at Ch'êh-mo or what is now Cherchen in Chinese Turkestan. As Po-ṣū 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 樂典 of Lu Fan 劉犧 (510–568) and his son Lu Hsiu-chêng 劉休炤 (or Hsiang 禧) (534–580) it is stated that the family name of (the king of) the country of Hua is Yen-ta 嚴麴 which their descendants have made the name of the country (T'ung-tien, Bk. 193 under Y-ta-tung 亦唐同). However, this does not necessarily mean that the name of Yen-ta was known to the Liang, because Lu Fan and his son, being men of the Northern Dynasties (Wei and Chou), probably replaced Yen-tai-i-li-tô 亦帶夷粟陀 of the Liang-shu with Yen-ta 嚴麴 which was familiar to them. As for the Liang-tien, see biographies of Lu Fan and his son in the Chou-shu, Bk. 42, fol. 4a–b, Pei-shih, Bk. 70, fol. 6a–b, and Ėrh-shih-su-i-shih 二十五史補編, IV, p. 4958–59, 4265–66. The I-nien-lu wei-pien 疑年録要録, Bk. 2, fol. 11b (ed. 1925), based on the 3rd series of I-nien-lu, gives the date of birth and death of Lu Hsiu-chêng as his father's. cf. p. 14 Note 4.
known as Yen-ta 靳咄 or Hsien-ta 靳咄 or I-ta 抗忸 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 满, 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 shao 饒 or parched oat flour and mutton meat: lions, camels with two legs and horned wild asses are their beasts. 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 湨忸 (or the Ephthalites) lies to the south of the river Wu-hu 烏循 (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. 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). The Sui-shu describes I-ta 抗忸 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 Warwâliz 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 Warwâliz 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-ye的大業 (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.

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 蓼知 (Bakhthi) of Yen-ta 靳咄 or the Ephthalites and Sung-yün 也 states that in 519 the

---

(1) 《地名索引》，土地溝底，多山川樹木，有五股，國人以至及羊肉為糧，其國有寶子，兩腳駝駝，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 諏訪時記, Shûin, XXI, p. 139, says that one 地 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，願得適人來使來朝，寶衣一（Wei-shu, Bk. 8, fol. 5a) Here 蓼知 does not mean 靮咄 and 蓼知, but 蓼知 of 蓼(INT). In the Annals of Wei, when embassies from more than one country were received at the same time, it is recorded with the word 和 “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-chwáng 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 萬鉉 writes that the southern road (of Hsi-yü) leads to Northern P'ó-lo-mên 婆羅門 (or Northwestern India) via Hu-mî 護密 (Kumêdh in Wakhân), T'u-huo-lo 吐火羅 (War-wâliz), I-ta 把怛 (Balkh), Fan-yen 帆延 (Bâmiyân) and Ts'ao 濱 (Ghazna), and, just like the Sui-shu, Bk. 83, he says nothing about Hua 浮 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 獻哒 (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 于阗 (Khotan) at the distance of 10,100 lì from Ch'âng-an 長安 (the capital of Chou). The king governs at Pa-ti-yen-ch'êng 拔底垣城 which probably means Wang-shê-ch'êng 王舍城 (or king’s residence). The city is ten and odd lì in width.”(4) Marquart identifies Pa-ti-yen with New Persian pašt-i-yân, “of kind, 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 lì, the distance between Ch'âng-an and Hsien-ta, equals to the total of distance between Ch'âng-an to Kua-chou 瓜州 (3,600 lì) and that between Kua-chou and I-ta (6,500 lì);(6) (2) the width of the capital of Hsien-ta and I-ta is equally 10 and

---

(1) 周祖謨, 洛陽伽藍記校勘, p. 100.
(2) Records of Western Countries, ed. Kyoto University, Bk. 1, p. 28–31: Watters, I, p. 1080f.
(3) Sui-shu, Bk. 67 (fol. 3b). (4) See p. 8. (5) Wehret und Arang, p. 36, 38, etc.
(6) This is obvious from the comparison of distance given in the Chou-shu and Sui-shu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>from Ch'âng-an (Chou-shu)</th>
<th>from Kua-chou (Sui-shu)</th>
<th>From Ch'âng-an to Kua-chou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>焉耆</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>房茲</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>婆噣</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>(3,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>把怛</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>(3,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>波斯</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>于闐</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this the distance between Ch'âng-an and Kua-chou is calculated as 3,600 lì. The only exception is the distance to Khotan from Ch'âng-an and Kua-chou, which is given as 7,700 and 2,900 respectively. In this case, the distance between Ch'âng-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 Hsûan-chwang passed the city, which corresponds to Pa-li-yen-ch'êng, the name of the capital of Hsien-ta.(2)

As I have quoted above, the Liang-shu states that Po-t'î 白题 or Bakhshî was ruled by Chun Shih-chi-i 支師彌 who sent an envoy to the Liang in the 3rd year of Pu-t'îng 普通 (522).(3) But the Liang-shu never refers to its submission 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'î but also so many countries subjugated to the Ephthalites intercourse 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. 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 阿絹城 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) 吐呼蘿國……漁師, 周匝六十里 (Pei-shih, Bk. 97, fol. 6b=Wei-shu, Bk. 102, fol. 5a). The description of T'û-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'û-hu-lo 吐呼蘿 under the 12th month of the 5th year of Ho-p'îng (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'û-hu-lo and its capital must have come to the Wei in 464–465. At that time, Po-t'î 白題 or Bakhshî (Balkh) was the centre of Tokhârestân as before.

(b) 漁師可四十里 (白頭西蕃記, quoted in the 太平寰宇記, Bk. 186 under T'û-huo-lo 吐火羅). This information obtained by Wu Chieh 與絕, who went to Western Countries as an ambassador of Yang-tî (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) 蠶罙國……其王治坡延域. 蠶王舍城也. 其城方十餘里 (Chou-shu, Bk. 50, fol. 3b). See p. 8.

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

(e) 罷罙國……邇大都城周二十餘里, 人皆謂之小王舍城 (Hsûan-chwang, Records, ed. Kyoto University, Bk. I, p. 28). By the way, I am of the opinion that Fu-ho 罵呼 (*bîwak-kâ-tâ) is transcribing *Bax(!)-kâth or the city of Baxl.

(2) According to P. Hartmann, Hsûan-chwang’s Hsiao Wang-shê-ch’êng is for Persian shâh-wârân (Encyclopaedia of Islam under Balkh).

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

Warwâlisâ(1) to the north of what is now Kunduz. At the middle of the 7th century, the T'ang set up there Yû-chê-shih Tu-tu-fu 月氏都督府 to control the Tokhârestân region.(2) A-huan is also written as Ė-huan (*di-xuân) 逆換 or Po-huan (*pûît-xuân) 換换, all of which are transcriptions of Warwâl. 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 2 or two of the Sui-shu as a scribal error of letter wu 五 or five, because five 2 square means twenty 2 in circuit.(3)

(1) Marquart, Erdalâr, p. 60, note 4: Do., Wehret und Arang, p. 44. Cf. Géographie d'Aboul-féda, trad. Reinaud, II, 2, p. 207: “Walwâlidj est la capital du Tokharistân, qui fut anciennement le royaume des Hayâtîlah.” (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. Bargier 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 Warwâlisâ 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 Warwâliz, both being the capital of Tokhârestân. In his Records Hsüan-chwang says Huo was under the rule of T'uchîeh 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 Yabû Khâyan at his residence in Huo.

(2) 唐書, Bk. 43 (fol. 4b) says: “月氏都督府, 以吐火羅葉護阿鉢城置, 額州二十五.” (Chavannes, Documents, p. 68–69).

唐書, Bk. 221b (fol. 3a) says: “吐火羅……國大中, 以其阿鉢城, 爲月氏都督府, 驚小城, 爲二十四州, 親王阿史那都督.” (Chavannes, Ibid., p. 69)

太平寰宇記, Bk. 186 says: “吐火羅……都州……大都為阿鉢城為月氏都督府, 各分其小城爲二十四州, 以 [葉護] 燕瀚為都督.”

(3) 旧唐書, Bk. 40 (fol. 19b): 月氏都督府, 於吐火羅國所治遇換城置, 以其葉護 (耶護) 於其部份, 分置二十四州, 都督統之. The T'iang Hui-yo 唐會要, Bk. 73, also writes 遇換.

(4) 岐建功旧唐書校勘記所引太平寰宇記 (T. Fujita 藤田豊, Tózai Kōshiki no Kenkyû, 西域交涉史の研究 Seikiki-hen, 西城篇 p. 27).

(5) In 1938, British Expedition led by Professor Evert Bargier of the University of Bristol 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 Warwâliz, 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 circumference, 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 aligned 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 yabu to control the area to the south of the Iron Gate, (1) that is to say, Tokharestán and a part of Transoxiana. The yabu of the T' u-chüeh continued to rule Tokharestán even after the destruction of the T' u-chüeh empire by the T'ang. The Yüeh-shih Tu-tu-fu ruled twenty-five chou or provinces, including Badakhshan and Bakhdhi or Balkh. (2) This means that Balkh became a mere local political centre in Tokharestán 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 Badakhshan. (3)

According to the Sui-shu, Bk. 83 (fol. 4a) and T'ang-shu, Bk. 221b (fol. 3a), Tokharestán 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'eng 施怛厥城 of the T' u-chüeh. (4)

Suleiman, which Mr. Pope has recently surveyed on the western marches of the Sassanian 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 Sassanian kings maintained a shaky hold on the Bactrian frontier.” (Excavations in Swat and Explorations in the Oxas 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 Adach, Kiroku 足立喜六, Chōan shiseki no kenkyū 長安史蹟の研究, Text, The Tōbō Bunko Ronshū, 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 ten the existence of which Hsian-chwang records in the Kunduz region (Ib. 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 Sassanian kings maintained a shaky hold on the Bactrian frontier as Barger and Wright suggest (p. 44) or one of them is the site of Warwálz.

(1) Life, Bk. 5 (fol. 19a), ed. Tōhō Bunka Gakuen Kyōto Kenkyūsho. See also the T'ang-shu, Bk. 221b (fol. 2b).

(2) Ta-hsia-chou 大夏州 was established at Fu-ch'ih-ch'eng 襄甌城, that is to say, Bakhdhi (Balkh) and Yüan-t'ang-chou 藿嗇州 at Pa-t'ê-shan-ch'êng 披特山城 or Badakhshan. Fujita is of the opinion that ch'ih 叼 or Fu-ch'ih is a scribal error of ch'a or *fa 叫 (慧超傳異記, ed. 1910, fol. 56a). But I think Fu-ch'ih (*bhâk-t'î) 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 Badakhshan (Wehrst und Arang, p. 47, note), to which I can not agree. Marquart is also of the opinion that Huo-lu comes from ardu (Ibid., p. 48 note). Herrmann is more prudent because he doubts locating the T'ai-han Tu-tu-fu in Badakhshan 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. Huı-chao 惧超, 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 概陀. (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 Huı-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 呼摩陀羅 to the west of Badakhshân

The last and the biggest centre of the Epithalites 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) Hsi-tan-chhwang 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 鄂貴難. It is 3,000 and odd 里 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,

---

(3) Ibid., p. *49. The name of the yabγu is written as Ku-tu-ku Chi-chiu-tu 骨督督額度 in the Ts'ai-fu yuán-huai, but chi-chiu 額 is written tun 艱 in the T'ang-chhu, Bk. 221b (fol. 3a) (Chavannes, Ibid., p. 158), T'ai-ping huan-yü-chî 太平寰宇記, Bk. 186 under T'u-huo-lo and T'ang-hai-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 ¾ metre and another is ten twelfth of the former. According to the Liu-tien 大典, Bk. 3, under Hu-pu 戶部, the measurement concerning ceremonial head-dress of officers is conformed to the longer ch'ih. (Adachi, Kiroku, Chûzan shitsuki no kenkyû 長安史跡の研究, 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 羅 (Śākyya) origin. Many (countries) to the west of Ts'ung-ling 產 or Pamirs[1] had been subjugated. As their territory adjoins the Tu-chüeh's, they have been influenced by manners and customs of the latter. In addition, they made invasions and plundered 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 chiefs. They (also) live in tent of felt and remove from one place to another. The country adjoins Ch'i-li-shê-mo 言粟訥鎌 in the west.[2] By travelling eastwards through valleys 200 and odd li, one reaches Po-to-ch'ung-na 銅創那 or Badakhshân.[3] Hsüan-chwang also tells us that one of the four Śākyas of Kapilavastu, who survived the massacre of Virūḍhaka, king of Kosala, became the king of Hsi-mo-ta-lo[4] and that the king of Hsi-mo-ta-lo of T'hu-huo-lo conquered the Ch'i-li-li-to 言利利 or Kritā in Kashmir in the 600th year after the death of Kanishka.[5]

Hsi-mo-ta-lo, which means "foot of the snow mountain", stands for Himatāla "snow plain".[6] And Cunningham, Marquart and Windekenks have reason to consider that it is a Sanskritized form of Hepthal or some of its variants.[7] 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

---

1. Hsüan-chwang means by Ts'ung-ling a mountain group which adjoins the Hindūkush in the south, Isāk-kul and Ch'ien-ch'üan 千泉 (Aulie Ata) in the north, Huo 胡 in the west and Wu-sha 峨 in the east. (Wu-sha is situated to the east of K'o-p'an-t'o 前盤陀 or Tashkurgan.) Cf. Records, Bk. 12, p. 20 (ed. Kyoto University).

2. Ch'i-li-shê-mo is a transcription of Krisma or Kṣima and is located at either Tālikān (Chuningham), Ish-Keshm (St. Martin) and Kishm (Yule). I would like to take Kishm as did Hori, Kentoku 堺護, Kaisetsu Saiiki 萌速西域記, Tokyo 1912, p. 949.


Pei-shih (=Wei-shu), Sai-shu,\textsuperscript{(1)} T'ung-tien, Bk. 193 under T'u-huo-lo and, above all, by Sung-yün,\textsuperscript{(2)} though the explanations given in these books are different.\textsuperscript{(3)} It was in 664 that Hsüan-chwang passed Hsi-mo-ta-lo, i.e. about one hundred years after the destruction of the Epthalite empire. And, at that time the Epthalites were scattered in several parts of Tokharestân, 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 Epthalites.

Hsi-mo-ta-lo is roughly located on the middle reaches of the Kokcha to the west of Badakhshan.\textsuperscript{(4)} And it was probably in what was Hsi-mo-ta-lo at the time of Hsüan-chwang that Sung-yün saw the Epthalite king and queen in 519.\textsuperscript{(5)} Even today there remain a place named Yaftal and a people called Yaftali.\textsuperscript{(6)}

Of these four places (i.e. Ghûr, Balkh, Warwâfiz and Hsi-mo-ta-lo) where there were centres of the Epthalite empire, which one is the original region of the Epthalites? 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 Epthalites 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 Epthalites. (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 Epthalites.\textsuperscript{(7)} It will mean that the Epthalites pressed the Kidârites in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{(1)} See p. 8.
\item \textsuperscript{(2)} Sung-yün, ed. Chou Tzu-mo, p. 101.
\item \textsuperscript{(3)} No explanation is given by Sung-yün. In all records except Hsüan-chwang, it is said that the number of born means the number of her husband’s brothers to whom she is also to get married. Concerning this, see p. 51 ff.
\item \textsuperscript{(4)} If we locate Chhîh-li-shê-mo 記載疑似 at Kishm as has been done by Yule, Hsi-mo-ta-lo lies between Kishm and Badakhshan. See Horiz, Kentoku, Kâiatsu Saiôshi 資料西域記, p. 951.
\item \textsuperscript{(5)} It was in a large plain between Po-ho 鈴和 (Ishkash in Wakhân) and Po-chîh.波知 (which lies between Zebak and Chîtral, according to Marquart, Erdnâsia, p. 245) that Sung-yün saw the Epthalite king.
\item \textsuperscript{(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, Wêhrest 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 Samarkand, G. S. G. S. 2555, Sheet N. J. – 42, Third edition. Professor Iwamura, Shinobu 岩村信 saw a group of people who called themselves Yaftuli, but no information about their location.
\item \textsuperscript{(7)} K. Enoki, Kidâra-shichô no nendai ni tsuite キダラ王朝の年代について (On the date of the Kidârites), Tôyô Gakukai, XLI, 3, 1938, p. 298–298.
\end{itemize}
Balkh from the east. (3) Hsi-an-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 Ghür as their original place, as it was of the Ghürïds in the 12th century, but it cannot 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". 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

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. 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.\(^{10}\) Most of these coins are after the fashion of Kuśāna, 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.\(^{11}\) 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.\(^{12}\)

As I have quoted above, Hsüan-chwang writes that the king of Hsi-mo-talo or the Ephthalites was originally of Śākyā, just as kings of Uḍḍiyāna, Bāmiyān and Shang-mi or Chitral.\(^{13}\) The ground for this statement is not known, but it will mean that he saw little ethnographical difference among kings of these countries. Bāmiyān and Shang-mi, being situated in the neighbourhood of Balkh and Badakshān respectively, where there were big centres of the Ephthalites, were probably conquered by the Ephthalites and Uḍḍiyāna was possibly
under their prestige.(1) But the king of Udhyāna, who was a pious believer of Buddhism at the time of Hsuan-chwang, may not have been Ephthalite, but probably of Aryan or Iranian stock. Actually, Hui-chao never notices that the king of Udhyāna was Tu-čüeh突厥 and the king of Bāmiyān was Hu胡 which means Iranian.(2) So the tradition of Śākya 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(-We-shu魏書) says: “Their language differs from that of the Juan-juan, Kao-ch’ê, and various Hu 謝胡.”(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 謝胡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 Hsuan-chwang, in Tu-huo-lo鈕貨羅 or Tokharestân, “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 Hsuan-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 Tokharestân 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 Horii 堺賢治 (Kaisetsu Saijiki 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 烏茲國 and the Hsi-yü-chih 西域志 (see p. 13n. 5) quoted in the Fa-yüan-chai-lin 法苑珠林 Bk. 39 (Tripiṭaka Taishō, Vol. 58, p. 597b) write about the mount T’an-č’ê-shan 營盤山 in the south-west of the country and its ass which carry food to the temple on the mountain without a driver. The same thing is recorded in the Tzu-yang-tsu-tsu 鄭陽德疏, Hsi-chi 緯集, Bk. 8, as the story of Yen-ta 延陀 country of Hsi-yü 西域. This may be because Udhyāna was known to China as a part of the Ephthalite empire. The excavations of the Swat 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) 其言語與塞北高車及諸胡不同.

(4) In Northern and Southern Dynasties, 胡胡 meant foreigners, of which tribes of Hsiung-nu 奴罕 and Iranian stock were best known. See Lô Suô-mien 呂思勉, Hu-k’ao 胡考 in Yen-shih cha-chi 营石札記, Shanghai, 1937, p. 163–171.

(5) 話言文字, 稍異於胡, 言語二十五六, 言語相生, 用之相物, 當以揣摩, 自左向右, 書字漸多, 達 華章利 Records, Bk. 1, ed Kyoto University, p. 25) See also BSOS, 1937, p. 891.
The Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko

(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 Kanîška 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 bilingual 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 Tokhari (?), MS. JAS, 64, 1944, p. 1.
(2) Cunningham, Later Indo-Iranian, Numismatic Chronicle, 1894, p. 263.
   E. Herzfeld, Kushano-Sassanian Coins, Calcutta, 1930.
   also Filliozat’s information given to Sten Konow in Festschrift til Professor O. Broch, p. 80.
   Do., Die Berliner Ephthaliten-Fragmente, La Nouvelle Clio, 1951, p. 41–69 (I owe the microfilm of
   Hansen’s second article to Professor L. Peter of Rome. The fragment here studied is
   Orientalische Archiv, III, 125, at the Ethnographical Museum in Berlin. It was also studied by Sten Konow in
   The White Huns and Tokharian, Festschrift 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 Ishihara 石渡純太郎, Töyóšû no Hanashi 東洋學の話, Osaka, 1945
   p. 137; and F. W. Thomas in JAS, 64, 1944, p. 1.)
   F. W. Thomas, A Tokhari (?), MS. JAS, 64, 1944, p. 1–3.
(5) F. W. Thomas, op. cit., p. 3.
Ephthalites from the annals.\textsuperscript{(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, having no letters and no politeness and education.\textsuperscript{(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).”\textsuperscript{(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 Tokharestân 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 Tokharestân respectively. In this sense it is probable that the so-called Ephthalite language is nothing but the language of Tokharestân, 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 ‘Erðaiztau and Yen-tai-i-li-t'o 獨帝栗陶 came from Sogdian plural *Heβtalit (sing. *Heβtalak),\textsuperscript{(4)} but it is yet to be decided what is the genuine form of the name\textsuperscript{(5)} and and what is its meaning.

\textsuperscript{(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.)

\textsuperscript{(2)} Ed. Chou Tsu-mo, p. 101. 郡上不知, 文字, 禮教俱闕.

\textsuperscript{(3)} 無文字, 以木為契, 與旁國通則使旁國胡爲胡書, 羊皮為紙,……其言語待河南人譯, 然後通.

\textsuperscript{(4)} W. B. Henning in ZDMG, XC, 1936, p. 17 note 2.

\textsuperscript{(5)} Cséglédy Károly, IV–IX. évszázad népmozgalmak a steppán, Budapest, 1954, p. 4–5.
(2) *Axšunwar* (1) Title or the name of king who fought with Pērōz. Salemann (2) and F. W. K. Müller (3) have explained that the word is Sogdian *xšam, xšam* “king”, while Henning tried to establish that *Axšondar—Sog. Xšamder “Machthaber, Machträger” 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 *axšunvar*. (6) Is Warz, (7) name of another king, a corrupted form of (axš)unvar?

(3) *t’ung* (*d’ung*): In the T’ung-tien 道典, Bk. 193, it is stated that I-ta- t’ung 抄相同 was also called I-ta-kuo 抄相國 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 *t’un*, which means place in Ormuri, Parachi, Yagnobi, Sughni: -don or döna, (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 (Nēzak): 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 tarqa or tarkan of the Orkhon Inscriptions and other Central Asian records, (12) which is derived from Chinese ta-kuan (*d’at-kuan) 塔官, “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

---

(3) Sogdische Texte, I, Abhilk, PAK, 1913, p. 108.
(4) QDMG, XC, 1936, p. 17 note 2.
(7) Nöldeke, op. cit., p. 159.
(8) 抄相同, 塔塔塞又謂抄相同焉。 The T’ung-tien 道典, Bk. 193, also writes that Hua 滑 was called Hua-tun 滑臣 under the Posterior Wei (Toba Wei) 滑臣...至後魏時，謂之滑臣。臣 is a scribal error of 衆. But the Wei-shu does not refer to Hua-tun and the T’ai-p’ing huæn-yü-chi, Bk. 183, reads Yen-ta-kuo 順駱國 instead of Hua-tun. So I wonder if Hua- tun is an error of Yen-ta.
(10) Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, I, Anhang, p. 94.
(12) See S. E. Malov, Pamyatniki drevneturkskot pis’menosti, Moskva-Leningrad 1951 p. 427. It is identical with Skt. ānatya (Fun-yu ta-ning 梵語雅名, Tripitaka Taishō, LIV p. 1232c).
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 Badakhshan, the language of them is supposed to be very similar to the so-called Pamir dialects. From linguistic 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. 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 軍師, namely Turfan, and from the fact that their language differed from that of Juan-juan 軍師 and Kao-chê 高車, he argued that the Ephthalite language was probably the so-called Tokhari. 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 Ârçi. Essai sur les appellations du "tokharien" (Le Musée, 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 Musée, 11), Louvain, 1941, p. XXI–XXVII, he repeatedly emphasized his view. According to him, ārçi (ārī), 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 ārī 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 素 (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 Tokharestân, were decidedly descendants of Tokhara or Yü-shih 月氏 tribe who used the ārī 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 Windekens's views. So I could only touch the point in question. To begin with, it is not yet fixed if ārī really means

(1) L. Petech in Le Civilità dell’Oriente, Storia, Roma, 1956, p. 932.
“white”. In 1935 Naoshirō Tsuji (alias Fukushima) interpreting ārī as meaning “white” and associating this with the fact that the royal titles of Karashar always end in -aruna (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 Ārī language. In 1939, four years later, Windekkens in his “Note sur l’étymologie de Ārī (Revue belge de Philologie et d’Histoire, XIII, 1939, p. 955ff.) arrived at the same conclusion. Even after that, Windekkens repeats and emphasizes his view. Then Bailey, in 1937, advocated the view that ārī in question was derived from Central Asian Prakrit ārī-, Skt. ārī, that it could not be taken as a self-assumed title in the so-called Tokharian, and that what was called the ārī text was nothing but a Sanskrit text. Against this, Sieg, Windekkens and Wang Ching-ju presented contrary opinions. Sieg insisted that Central Asian Prakrit ārī can not be changed into ārī. Wang Ching-ju tried to establish that Yen-ch‘i Chinese name for what is now Karashar from the time of Han, is nothing but a transcription of ārī which is the original name. If ārī means white as Windekkens 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 Tokharestān and not in Kucha-Karashar-Turfan area where the Tokharian B and A were used. Actually, the Po family of Kucha had been famous for its unbroken line from the time of Han up to the T‘ang and no evidence is available to prove that any member of their family had ever migrated to Tokharestān. 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 Ārī. The Ephthalites were nomads, while the ārī-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.

1. N. Fukushima, On the Designation-Problem of the so-called Tokharian language, Memorial Volume dedicated to the late Prof. Katoji Fujioka, Tokyo, 1935, p. 7–12.
8. Under the Toba Wei, there were some Hsiung-nu family named Po or White. See Yao Wei-yüan, Pei-chiao hua- hsing K‘ao 北朝鮮習考, 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 Tokhārestān. But his suggestion can not easily be accepted as correct, because not only in Tokhārestān, but also in Bāmiyān, Shignan and Shang-mi (Chitrāl) the same type of scripts was used and it has yet to be fixed that the language of the fragment is that of Tokhārestān. The fragment studied by Sten Konow is the same one which was later studied and published by O. Hansen. It came from Turfan. Another fragment studied by F. W. Thomas was discovered in the Lou-lan site. And this will make one imagine exportation of literature in the language of Tokhārestān 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 Ārči may have some relation in this sense.

According to Hsüan-chwang, the language of Tokhārestān, which may be called genuine Tokharian, was current only in Tokhārestān in the 7th century. And Hsi-mo-ta-lo, the native place of the Ephthalites making a part of Tokhārestān, 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 Tu-yū-hun 吐谷渾 will make us hardly believe that their language was quite the same as Tokharian or the language of Tokhārestān, 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 Badakhshān area, Sung-yun 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." Further, of the Ephthalites who ruled Gandhāra Sung-yun says: "The disposition of the people is cruel and vindictive, and they practise the most barbarous atrocities. They do not believe in Buddhism, but love to worship kuei-shên 鬼神 or demons."

The Liang-shu 梁書, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b)

(1) The White Huns and Tokharian. Festschrift til Professor Olaf Broch, Oslo, 1947, p. 77, 82.
(2) See p. 40 note 4.
(3) In this connection, see W. B. Henssle’s new theory in Argi and the "Tokharians", BSOS, 1X, 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, Hsu-chao 翁超 noticed that the language of Tokhārestān was also partly used in Khuttal. It runs as follows: 食骨慕節, 此王元是突厥舊族, 當時百姓, 牛胡, 牛突厥......言音, 牛火虜, 牛突厥, 牛著士. Cf. Fujita, ed. 1910 fol. 73b. "The country is named Ku-chʻu (Khuttal). The king is originally of Tu-chüeh stock, while the general people who live in the country are partly Hs (or Iranian) and partly Tu-chüeh......Their language is either Tu-huo-lo or Tu-chüeh or native (Khuttal language)."
(6) 不信佛法, 多事外神, 決生血食 (諸葛僧證記, 經五, 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 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-yên's account coincides with that of Hsi'an-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-yên's account correspond to Heaven-god and Fire-god in the Liang-shu, and it goes without saying that fire-worship formed a characteristic of the Persians and other Iranian tribes.[3]

However, it is not clear what Heaven-god refers to? May this he 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 Tângri-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 Epithalites built their tents with their entrance faced 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-nah-hsi-lo 車那毗羅 in Ghazna would be considered. Under Ts'ao-kuo 滇國 or Zâbul (Ghazna), the Su-ushu 懸書, Bk. 83 (fol. 5a), reads as follows; "the people worship objectionable gods. In the Ts'ung-ling-shan 惠陵山 or Pamirs

---

(1) 天神火神，每日則出戶祀神而後食。其施一拜而止。我欲知每日“every day” is a scribal error of 每日 “every morning”. (2) See p. 34.

(3) Now see K. Erdmann's excellent study Das Iranische Feuerheiligtum, Leipzig, 1911, 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.


(5) The Pei-shâ, Bk. 97 (fol. 5b) says on Persia that the people worship both Huo-shên 火神 and T'ien-shên 天神. But the Ch'ou-shu, Bk. 50 (fol. 4a) says that the people worship Huo-hsien-shên 火獻神.

(6) The Liang-shu, Bk. 54 (fol. 8b) says: “They make felt house their dwellings, of which the door is open towards east 西向開門, 東向開戶.” The Q'ayan of T'u-chüeh also built his tent facing east, which is explained by the author as to pay respect to the place where the sun rises. 西向開於帳中, 崗於東開, 鼻於所出也, 周書, Bk. 50, fol. 1b—北史, Bk. 99, fol. 2a). In the language of T'u-chüeh, “front” means “east” (cf. ilgāra “in front, in the east” of the Orkho Inscriptions.) The Indians also built their house with gate open towards east. Hsi'an-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 horseback 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 狄那嗁羅 in Kāpiso, who tried to remain in A-lu-nao 阿路霛 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 Zābul.(2) And under Ts’ao-chü-ch’ā 潮矩吒 (Zābul) 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 the heretics are frequently able to control disease and recover the sick.”(3) According to Watters, A-lu-nao 阿路霛 is aruya which means a red colour, dawn; Ch’u-na-hsi-lo 狄那嗁羅 is išna-šila, namely išna-rock; probably these refer to Sun-god.(4) Hori 植 takes hsi-lo as Iranian hilla Sanskrit iira “mountain peak”.(5) Over against this, Kurakichí Shiratori 白鳥庫吉 took Shun T’ien-shên or Ch’u-na-hsi-lo as Visāku or Water-god, and from the fish-bone alloted to Shun T’ien-shên in the Sai-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) 言神祠，瀕山有順天神，義制極華，金銀鑄為屋，以銀為地，祠者日有千餘人，祠前有一魚骨脊，其孔中通，有路出入，當有識為魚頭冠，坐金馬座。
(2) Records, Bk. 1, p. 39.
(3) 其天祠名自古於息國阿路霛山，徙居此國南界察那憂羅山中，作神作祠，為立為伍，信者富足。福澤騰騰，月眾授位，上下並之。國異俗，君臣儀裲，每歲嘉辰，不期而會，或有金銀銅器，或以牛馬獻祭，競獻貢奉，俱仲貢奉。所以金銀布地，羊馬滿谷，無敢報怨。唯修盛奉，宗事外施，克孝行，天神受其屍，外河通行多劫，治療疾病，顛蒙痊愈。Records, Bk. 12, ed. Kyoto University, p. 3-4).
(4) T. Watters, On Tuan Chwang’s Travels in India, I, p. 127.
(5) Kaisetsu Sōzōki, p. 940.
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 湈 (Zábul), as told in the Sui-shih, 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 Kumāra, his son who was worshipped as a mountain-god in Tamul, and on the ground that Kumāra'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 Tângri 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


\(^{2}\) Les Chimiites-Éphthalites, p. 120–124.


\(^{5}\) I am inclined to agree to SHRIMATI 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' \(a\) 湈船人 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 in spite 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 Avalokitesvarā Bodhisattva, 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 Zābul 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 *Su-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 Rājagha. Hsüan-chwang writes about the country Huo that many people believe in the san-pao 三寶 or tiratna and only a few pay respect to other gods or spirits: there are ten sanghārāmas with several hundred followers: they study both the Mahāyāna and the Hinayāna, and practise the discipline of both."\(^3\) The *Yu-yang-tsa-tsu* 西楊德經, *hsi-chieh* 續集, Bk. 8, says: “In the country of Yen-ta 異達 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 *jin* 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-shih* (＝*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 Ti-en-shen which is obviously the Shun Ti-en-shen or Ch'ü-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, 隨功修習.
(4) 西域薩婆鳴有寺戶, 以數頭健銀領上山, 無人驅逐, 自能往返, 後發午至, 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, 埋葬他尊, 父母死, 其子截一耳, 埋葬他尊.
(2) The expression of ts’ang 習 “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, Pomiatniiki drevnieturkskikh p’em-memori, 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, 高外有別居, 唯知喪葬之事, 謂為不淨人, 若入城市, 取 (拏在北史) 鎮自別 (Chou-shu, Bk. 50, fol. 4a, 波斯).
(4) As regards this custom, see Namio Eguchi 上波比夫, Yūrashia Hoppō Minzoku to sórei ni okeru Rimen, sai-jī, sen-patsu ni tsuite ～ラシア北方民族の葬禮における幕面、裁耳、剪髪について (Concerning face-disfiguring, ear-cutting and hair-clipping at the funerals among North-Eurasian tribes), Yūrashia Hoppō Bunka to Kenkyū ユーラシア北方文化の研究, Tokyo, 1931, p. 144-157.
(5) Procopius and Menander Protecto (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, 搭席而治, 以輕為屋, 以壁為巢, 冬則寒溫, (宋雲, 搭帳條記, 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, La-yang-chia-lan-chi, Bk. 5) and 無城郭, 搭席而治, 以輕為屋, 以壁為巢, 冬則寒溫, (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 Hsi-an-chung-shu 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-shih＝Wei-shu) represents the Ephthalite king as ruling at the city of Pa-ti-yen 披底延 (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 陝書, 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 garment 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'ang-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 抉恱 (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 襄賓 (Kâpisa), Fan-yin 犯引 (Bâmiyân) and Sieh-yüeh 謝譜 (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) 詳見兄弟共一妻，夫無兄弟者，其妻戴一角帽。若有兄弟者，依其多少之數，加角焉。Also to the same effect in the Sui-shu. See p. 8.
(2) 女人被裹，頭上刻木為角，長六尺，以金銀飾之，少女子，兄弟共妻。
(3) 兄弟同一妻，錫塗焉，每一年入房，戶外掛其衣以為志，生子隨其長兄。 This concerns T'ui-huo-lo, but may refer to the Ephthalites there lived.
(4) 多男少婦人，故兄弟適室，婦人五夫，則首戴五角，十夫戴十角，男子無兄弟者，則陽他人結塊為員，方始得妻，不然終身無妻矣，生子隨其長兄。 A very similar passage is found in the T'ang-hui-yao, Bk. 99, under T'ui-huo-lo.
(5) However, the Pei-shih=Wel-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) 慧超侍養錄. 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 Hunsish 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." 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 and Tomasek who referring to the existence of the so-called Nü-kuo (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. Marquart points out the existence of the custom of polyandry among the Hazâr and the Khalaj. Ghirshman suspects (Their marriages are a mere intermingling of the sexes) in Kâpisa as referring to this custom; and furthermore, 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. The custom of polyandry is frequently observed among the Aryans in India, among the Indo-Europeans and some other tribes. Herzel, in his excavation of Topé Baku to the north of Persepolis, discovered the ruins

---

(3) W. Tomasek, Kritik der ältesten Nachrichten über d. skythischen Norden, I, SAW zu Wism, 1888, p. 751; and, since he takes the Ephthalites as the descendants of Yüeh-shih, and therefore as Tibetans, he enumerates the instances of polyandry among the Ephthalites as of Tibetans in the Chinese records.
(7) Chôtsû-Tsû Ikeda 池田澄端, Mahâbhârata to Râmâyana, p. 77-90.
(8) Schrader-Nehring, Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde, s. Polyantrie.
of a peculiar village composed of a number of adjoining chambers, and surmised the practice of polyandry in pre-historic Iran. 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. At-Bräñi 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.”

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.” To cite instance, in the first half of the 5th century, Chū-ch’ü Mu-chien 渤渠牧犍, 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. The best-known instance is that of Tibet and its neighbourhood. A passage on Bolor in the Hsi-yü-wên-chien-lu 西域見聞錄, Bk. 3 (fol. 5a–b), and the Chih-i-hsin-pien 志異新編, Bk. 3, 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. The existence of the custom of polyandry in this region is

---

2. Herodotus, I, 216: “Each man marries a wife, but the wives are common to all.”
4. The Hsi-yü-wên-chien-lu 西域見聞錄, Bk. 3 (fol. 1b): 背人共妻, 輪流娶壻, 生子至六十歲, 限析産予之牲畜, 使自為計.
5. The Wei-shu *魏書*, Bk. 99 (fol. 4b), *T’ung-chien 諸葛*, Bk. 123, under the 3rd month of the 16th year of Yuan-chia 元嘉.
7. The Hsi-yü-wên-chien-lu has got many names and Chih-i-hsin-pien is one of them. Cf. Cordier, *Bib. Sinica*, IV, 2803, 2805 and 鄭信林, 中國邊疆圖籍錄, Shanghai, 1938 p. 185. 其人深目細口, 其風男女無別, 恨兄弟四五人, 共娶一妻, 次弟 (第) 當立, 以親屬戶主為記, 生子女, 亦次弟 (第) 分記。無兄弟者, 與戚屬貞之, 以聾協字。
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 Ladakis, 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 萬鶴 of the Shu-shu, Bk. 83 (fol. 2a), which reads “People are very obscene 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 謹軒記, 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 Chiang Ch’üan 賢霖, governor of Ning-hsia 偃夏. 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

---


\(^3\) 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. (Paula-Wesowa, *Realkenzülpfaden*, s.v. Issedonen; *Die Herkunft der Ungarn*, Turín, 1916, p. 344–362.) According to him, Iset, the name of the river, is a remnant of name Issedon.


\(^5\) 其俗淫縱無節，於諸夷中最後極耳。

\(^6\) Kiyoshi Sheratori’s article quoted in note (4).

\(^7\) 甘省陋俗：甘省多男少女，故男女之事縱無節，兄死妻繼，弟死妻替，比比皆是，同姓惟同類以下不婚，過此則不論也。有兄弟數人合娶一妾者，或輪夕而宿，或白晝有事，率聽一館於房門，即如廂館，生子則長者與兄，以次及諸弟云，其有不能娶而願子者，則僣他家女立券書限期，或二年券，或三年券，或以骨子為限，過時則原夫復歸，不能一目留也，客遊其地者，亦畱以借歴，立券書限期，即留其夫之家，履內客至，其夫親遇去，限外無論，不許，即其妻素與客最為近，亦必拒不納，欲親好者則更出微價乃可，亦（章）湖莊（遜）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 Tokharestân, 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-Yûn’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 嗆摩夷羅. (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 Chital. (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 Alganistan, with a peculiar language which is said to have some ancient characteristics of an Aryan language prior to the separation of the Iranian tribe. (4) 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. (5) 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. 頭戴一角, 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 mai-kuï 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.
(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 Eph-
thalites 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
manner and customs are represented as identical with those of the Tu-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 manner
and customs is an inevitable phenomenon arising from similarity of their envi-
enments. The Ephthalites could not be assigned as a Turkish tribe on ac-
count 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 in-
creased in the future and most of the newly discovered materials seem the more
to confirm my Iranian-tribe theory.

In 1901, in his Érânsahr, p. 253, MARQUART compared the Ephthalites with
Abdel, the old name of the Afghan Durrâni tribe, which has also been made by

(1) Comical Lady's Hats in Asia, China and Europe, TP., 1892, p. 422-429. As for Ku-ku,
see K. SHIRATORI, The Queve among the Peoples of North Asia, Memoirs of the Research
Department of the Tôyô Bunka, IV, 1929, p. 35-39 and Namio EGAMI, “Miko Fugin no Kushi Koko ni tokite 蒙古婦人の冠帽越せて (On the Mongol Women's Cap Ku-ku), Eurasia Hoppô
Bunka no Kenkyû にウラジオストロフ北方文化的研究, 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) Shunsô SHIGEMATSU 弦松俊章, Ehataru Shuzoku kô 唐蕃種族考 (A Study of the Ethnology
of the Ephthalites). J. MARQUART, basing on the passage of Ištakhri, 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 Ghür 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. MINORSKIY, Hadit al-Âlam, 1937, p. 317.) The same comment may be made on the
view advanced by H. H. HOWORTH, who identifies the Ephthalites with the Saragur
(Saruguri) who migrated down to the south (JRSA, 1892, p. 623.)

(4) Sten KONOW, The White Huns and Tokharian, Festskrift til Professor Olaf Broch, p. 77. Cf also
CZEGLEDY Karoly, IV-IX. Szczeci Népmozgalma a Steppe, Budapest, 1934, p. 5.
A. J. van Winkel tried to establish that the Ephthalites were no other than the true Tokharian language speaking people who were also called Ārja\(^{(1)}\). And in 1948, R. Ghirshman, chiefly rearranging the coins belonging to the Ephthalites, attempted to systematize the history of this tribe and, deciphering 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 Kāshgar 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 decipherment 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 松田満男 who identified Hua 滑 with Ghūr on the ground of phonetical resemblance of the name. See Kidāra Gesshi ni tsuite no kangae 寄多羅月氏に就いての考 (A Study of the Kidāra Yūshū-shi) Kokushigaku 関史學, III, p. 50–51.

p. 11. Note 4: Some people misunderstand that Ed. Speeht has established the Yüen-shih-Ephthalites identity in his article "Études 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, Speeht, 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-chê 高車 lived in Chin-shan 金山 at the beginning of the 6th century. Yün Fan 嶽範, Governor of Liang-chou 洛州 at the end of Shên-kuei 神龜 (520), produced a memorandum to the emperor, in which he said that the Kao-chê were living in Chin-shan, situated more than a thousand li (to the north of) Hsi-hai-chūn 西海郡 (i.e. Chū-yen 居延). Cf. Wei-shu, Bk. 69, fol. 5b and T'zu-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 Blanches et Ārja, Le Masén, LIV, 1941, p. 161–186.

\(^{(2)}\) Les Chionites-Ephthalites, 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 separately under the
same roof. (S. P. Tolstov, *Po sledom drevene khorezmiškoj tsivilizatsii*, Moskva-
Leningrad, 1948, s. 89-90.)

The Standard Histories of China, used in this article, is of the smaller