

Dating Yaśovarman of Kanauj on the Evidence of Huichao 惠超

Shoshin KUWAYAMA

The purpose of this article is to fix more exactly the date of Yaśovarman of Kanauj. His date has usually been given based on the interpretation of the accounts on Yaśovarman in the *Gaṇḍavaho* of Vākpati and his political relationship with Lalitāditya Muktapīda of Kaśmīr in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. Yet in the account of Huichao's pilgrimage in India and Central Asia and other Chinese historical sources of the Tang Dynasty some more information about this problem can be expected. Of vital importance is the date given by Huichao himself of his arrival at Kucha which also affords us an answer as to when he stayed in both Tokharistan and Gandhāra. The date of Huichao's stay in Gandhāra may, in turn, leads us to the framing of the date of his stay in Kanyakubja. In Kanyakubja, as Huichao tells us, an unnamed victorious 'king of Central India' 中天竺王 had resided.¹ By identifying him with Yaśovarman, his placement within a clearer chronological framework can also be deduced from other datable factors in Huichao's account itself and other Tang sources.

Before going further, some words should be given about Huichao's account. In Cave 17 of Dunhuang Pelliot found in 1908 a rather short manuscript of 227 lines, now housed and listed in the Bibliothèque Nationale as the Pelliot chinois, Touenhouang No. 3532. Despite the loss of its beginning and closing parts which must have contained the title and the author's name, Pelliot (1908: 511-512; 1936: 275) identified it as a 9th century abridged reproduction of the *Huichao Wang Wu Tian-zhuoguo zhuan* 惠超往五天竺國傳 (Record of Huichao's Travels in the Five Indic Regions), recollecting that the title of this record—and only the title—survived as quoted by Huilin 慧琳 in the 100th volume of his *Yiquijin Yinji* 一切經音義 (Dictionary of Phonetics and Meanings of the Specific Words in All the Translated Buddhist Sūtras and Literature,

completed in A. D. 817).

In this dictionary Huilin clearly mentions that Huichao's narrative is in three-volumes and explains the pronunciation or meanings, or both, of some eighty-five specific words selected by Huilin himself from each volume. The Pelliot chinois, on the other hand, is not divided into any volumes and lacks most of the words quoted by Huilin. There is no doubt, however, that the description of the manuscript covers almost all of Huichao's itineraries, i. e., from somewhere in East India up to Kucha. Moreover, a couple of words selected by Huilin from the third volume are also found among the last lines of the manuscript. Hence the direct assumption has been made that it was based on the same three-volumed edition as used by Huilin.

However, such a simple solution does not seem satisfactory. First, a basic question must be asked: Why does the manuscript lack most of the words quoted by Huilin? The manuscript could have included all of the words quoted by Huilin, if it were an abridged version. Secondly, the manuscript contains a number of misused words along with grammatical irregularities, all of them being too unfamiliar in proper Chinese sentences to be used in so official a report as one registered in the *Yiquijin Yinji*.

In fact, recent linguistic approach to the words and phrases in the manuscript has shed new light on this problem, rightly concluding that it is not an abridged copy of the three-volumed edition but a rush one reproduced by someone at Dunhuang in the 8th century after the original draft of Huichao and that, based on this draft, the account was later edited into a more official form comprising the three volumes which Huilin might have used on editing the *Yiquijin Yinji* (Takata 1992: 197-212). The more extensive book has been lost, but this copy of the draft has survived.²

1. A chronological framework based on Huichao

Since the manuscript lacks its beginning part, the first country available in the itinerary of Huichao is Kuśinagara. His itinerary as recorded in the manuscript is not always the same as that which he actually took. Although a couple of countries will have to be omitted as inserted from hearsay, as will be discussed later, the itinerary as it actually appears in the manuscript is as follows:

DATING YAŚOVARMAN OF KANAUJ ON THE EVIDENCE OF HUICHAO 惠超

An unidentifiable country in India to Kuśnagara:	30-day march.
Kuśnagara to Vārānasi:	Distance and direction are lost.
Vārānasi to Kanyakubja:	Perhaps 60-day march, to the west.
Kanyakubja to <i>a town of the South Indic king's residence</i> * ¹ :	90-day march to the south.
A town of the South Indic king's residence to <i>a town of the West Indic king's residence</i> * ² :	60-day march to the north.
A town of the West Indic king's residence to a North Indic country called Jālaṃdhara:	90-march to the north.
Jālaṃdhara to Takkadeśa:	30 days to the west.
Takkadeśa to Xintuogula* ³ :	30-day march to the west.
Xintuogula to Kaśmīra:	15 days to the north.
Kaśmīra to Gandhāra (Uḍabhāṇḍapura):	30-day march to the northwest.
Gandhāra to Lāghman:	7-day march to the west.
Lāghman to Jibin* ⁴ :	8-day march to the west.
Jibin to Zābul:	7-day march to the west.
Zābul to Bāmiyān:	7-day march to the north.
Bāmiyān to a town of the Tokhāra king's residence (Warwaliz):	20-day march to the north.
Warwaliz to a place in Badakhshān where the Tokhāra king had fled:	30-day march to the east.
Somewhere in Tokhāristan to Wa'khān:	7-day march to the east.
Wa'khān to Kharbandan (Tāshkurhān):	15-day march to the east.
Kharbandan to Kāshgar:	30-day march to the northeast.
Kāshgar to Anxi (Kucha):	30-day march to the east.
Kucha to Yanqi (Kara Shahr in later times):	?-day march to the east.

*1 - Assignable to Bādāmi. *2 - Either Alōr or Brāhminābād. *3 - Most probably the same as Siṃhapura in the *Da Tang Xiyuji*. *4 - Kābul. See discussions in this chapter. Places in italics were inserted in the itinerary by hearsay. See Chapter 3.

On line 217 of the manuscript Huichao says that he has arrived at Kucha during the first ten days of the 11th month in the 15th year of the Kaiyuan Era (開元15年11月上旬) of the Tang Dynasty. Since the 14th day of the 11th month in that year is identical with the 31st of December, A. D. 727, his arrival was in between the 18th and the 27th of December, A. D. 727. This date is basic for fixing other dates.

In Tokharistan he had snowfall which inspired him to write the poem seen on line 196. Snowfall naturally means that he was there in

the winter. This winter must be prior to December, A. D. 227 and is undoubtedly at least one year earlier than the time when Huichao arrived at Kucha. Earlier in his account, lines 155 to 156, Huichao says that going 20 days to the north after leaving Bamiyan he reached a town where the Tokhara king resided. This was called by him *fudiye* 縛底耶, a leading town in Tokharistan, identical with Warwaliz referred to by the Arab geographers and assignable to somewhere around Qal'a-ye Zal in the area of the lower Kunduz River (Kuwayama 1989: 120ff.).³ Based on my experience in Kunduz and environs in the latter half of the 1960s, snowfalls seldom occur in December; therefore, Huichao may have been in Tokharistan in the beginning of A. D. 727 at the earliest, if he stayed in Warwaliz during the snowfall.

In fact, Huichao does not refer to the specific place in Tokharistan where he had the snowfall: it may not have been *fudiye*. Lines 155 to 157 of the manuscript mention that by the time of Huichao's visit the Tokhāra king had fled to Badakhshan, a 30-day march to the east of the capital of Tokhāristan (Warwaliz), since the Arab troops had occupied it. Although the manuscript itself does not give any account as to how Huichao reached Badakhshān, a comparison of the 20-day march from Bāmiyān to the Tokhāra capital, shown in the manuscript, with the 30-day march from there to Badakhshān suggests that Huichao first arrived at Warwaliz and then proceeded to somewhere in Badakhshān. He also describes a 7-day march to Wa'khān from the Tokhāra country – quite a short distance in comparison with the 30-day march between Warwaliz and Badakhshān. The short distance implies that the Tokhāra country from where he proceeded to Wa'khān does not mean Warwaliz. The starting place for Wa'khān must be somewhere deep in the Badakhshān area, a place rather close to the western gateway to Wakh'ān, modern Ishkāshim. In such highlands snowfall could occur very much earlier than in the lower valleys of the Kunduz. If so, the date of his stay in Tokharistan could have been even as early as the autumn of A. D. 726.

The date thus provided also frames that of his stay in Gandhāra since we have good reason to suggest that Huichao was in Gandhāra during winter also. Before reaching this hypothesis, Huichao's description of Gandhāra and Jibin needs to be considered. On reaching Gandhāra after a one-month march through the mountainous region from Kaśmīra, Huichao wrote his account on Gandhāra (lines 140-142 in

ticular) as follows:

The king and his troops are all Turkish, while the local people are Hu barbarians.⁴ This country (Gandhāra) had originally been ruled by a king of Jibin (Kāpiśī) under whom the father of the Turkish king (in the time of Huichao) was subject with his tribesmen and his troops; when the Turkish forces became more active afterwards, he killed the king of Jibin and became the chief of the kingdom; accordingly, this kingdom abutted on the frontier with the supreme king of the Turks [of the northern land], ...but this usurper was not in the same line as the northern Turks....This town overlooks the big river of the Indus, located on its northern bank. ([] represents missing characters in the text and () should be read as supplementing the meanings.)

Huichao further describes Lāghman, a seven-day march to the west of Gandhāra, as being ruled by the Gandhāra country (or the Gandhāran king) without its own king. As for Jibin, an eight-day march to the west of Lāghman, i. e., in the Kābul Valley, Huichao describes it as follows:

This country is also ruled by the Gandhāran king, who is accustomed to be in Jibin in summer, seeking a cool place to live, and in Gandhāra in winter, seeking a warm place to live, since there are no snowfalls in Gandhāra, it being warm and not cold, while the Jibin country has much snowfall in winter, wherefore it is cold; the local people of this country (Jibin) are the Hu and the king and his troops are Turkish.

The countries extending from Gandhāra in the east to Jibin in the west in the Kābul Valley were controlled by the 'Gandhāran' king of Turkish stock. This statement gives the impression that there existed a king of Gandhāra whose rule extended to the Jibin region where there was another king. Yet this was not true. The historical reality is rather that the Kābul Valley and Gandhāra were ruled by one and the same king who resided in Jibin in summer and in Gandhāra, or more properly at Uḍabhāṇḍapura on the north bank of the Indus, in winter. Huichao's account that the 'Gandhāran king' ruled from there to Jibin seems to suggest that Huichao happened to arrive in Gandhāra right at the season when the king of the Kābul Valley was accustomed to reside there. In this connection the Turkish seizure of the Jibin kingship recorded by Huichao in the section of Gandhāra also suggests that the event may not have happened in Gandhāra itself but elsewhere in the

king's extensive domains.

Some thirty years later, Wukong 悟空, the vice-ambassador of the Tang Mission to the king of Jibin, arrived at Uḍabhāṇḍapura and clearly explained that this town of Gandhāra was the eastern capital 東都城 of Jibin. The 'eastern capital' presupposes the existence of a 'western capital.' For Wukong, the Jibin country seems to have denoted a more extensive country in geographical and political terms, a kingdom including the extensive Kābul Valley and having western and eastern capitals, the latter in Gandhāra. In view of the fact that Huichao uses Jibin and Gandhāra as two different localities, the whereabouts of Jibin needs to be further examined. The following argument reinforces doubts about Sylvain Lévi's identification of Jibin, so far as it is used in Tang China, exclusively with Kāpiśī which has long held the field as undebatable.

Huichao describes that when the Turkish forces became stronger the Turkish chieftain killed the king of Jibin and became chief of the kingdom. If the event did not happen in Gandhāra but somewhere in the Kābul Valley, it would not be historically inconsistent with Bīrūni's legendary story about a Turkish nobleman who eventually usurped the throne and began reigning in Kābul. Sachau translated it as follows (1964, II: 13-18):

The Hindus had kings residing in Kābul, Turks who were said to be of Tibetan origin; the first of them, Barhatakin (Barha Tegin, or Bōri Tegin), came into the country and entered a cave in Kābul, which none could enter except by creeping on hands and knees.... Some days after he had entered the cave, he began to creep out of it in the presence of the people, who looked on him as a newborn baby; he wore Turkish dress, a short tunic open in front, a high hat, boots and arms; now people honoured him as a being of miraculous origin, who had been destined to be king, and in fact he brought those countries under his sway and ruled them under the title of a shahiya of Kābul.

Apart from doubts about the strange mention of the Turks in Kābul as being of Tibetan origin, the rise of a *shahiya* of Kābul and his usurpation of power there strongly support the hypothesis that the Turkish seizure of the throne described by Huichao happened in Kābul, not in Gandhāra. It also suggests that Barha Tegin is one and the same with the father of the Turkish king at the time of Huichao. In fact, on Xuanzang's way to and back from India, in A. D. 629 and 643, a

Turkish ruler already resided in a country called Fulishi 弗栗特 located between Kāpiśī and Ghazni, as recorded in Vol. 12 of the *Da Tang Xiyu Ji* 大唐西域記. Insofar as it simply records that the king of the Fulishi-sthāna is of Turkish stock, the rule of the king seems to have been geographically and politically restricted as a local minor power, perhaps under the Kāpiśian hegemony (Kuwayama 1991: 282-283). Consistency with the above account of Bīrūnī implies that the Fulishi country of Xuanzang may be equivalent to the Kābul region.

The importance of the Kābul region may have gradually increased to become greater than ever parallel with the several waves of Muslim invasions from the south from A. D. 665 onward. On his way to Nalanda and back from there to China in A. D. 643 Xuanzang found that the Kābul region, the Fulishi country, was more or less peaceful ruled by a Turkish chieftain under the hegemony of the Kāpiśian king, but about two decades later the Turks of Kābul must have no longer been able to ignore the threat of the Arabs. In A. H. 46-47/A. D. 665-666 the Kābul Shah, the Turkish king of Kābul, was forced to fight against the Arab troops of Ibn Samurah (Murgotten 1969: 146-147). In the earlier stages of fighting against the Arabs the Kāpiśian king might have increased the Kābul Turks' military capacity to maintain the region, the southern frontier of the Kāpiśī kingdom. Yet, as events progressed, the voice of the Turkish minority probably increased, and gradually they themselves turned into a powerful threat, eventually seizing the Kāpiśian throne.

As the Tang sources mention, after the end of the seventh century Jibin often sent its missions to the Tang court together with Zābul. Associated missions of this kind had never appeared before that time, which suggests that Kābul and Zābul stood firm together against the Arab invaders. Jibin as used in Tang China, therefore, means Kābul after the Turkish usurpation that happened most probably soon after A. D. 666. Needless to say, the new king of Jibin, Barha Tegin, must have also ruled over the vast regions from Kābul to Uḍabhāṇḍapura where the second Turkish king, a son of Barha Tegin, resided on Huichao's arrival in winter.

The above argument leads us to interpret Huichao as follows: the Turkish king of Gandhāra was a ruler who governed from Gandhāra to Kābul and was accustomed to stay at Uḍabhāṇḍapura in the winter season and at Kābul in the summer. Huichao called him the king of Gandhāra because he happened to be residing in Gandhāra when Huichao visited

there. This means that it was in winter that Huichao travelled through Gandhāra. The king at the time must have been the son of Barha Tegin. Allowing for the date of his stay in Tokharistan, Huichao must have been in Gandhāra some time between the late autumn of A. D. 725 and the early spring of A. D. 726, not later than that. Since Huichao came to Gandhāra from the east beyond the Indus, his pilgrimage in the subcontinent was made before the date given above. This chronological framework allows us to discuss who was the king of Central India at Kanauj at the time of Huichao's visit and to narrow down the date of this sovereign.

2. A king of Central India: Yaśovarman

Lines 10 to 48 of Huichao's account is his record on Central India, an original translation of which follows:

Vārānāsī is reached within [...] days. This country, (like Kuśinagara,) is in decline without a king... (Here were) the Five Bhikshus (to whom the Buddha first preached). The clay images (of that scene) are present in a stupa. (There is a stambha) surmounted by a figure of a lion. The stone stambha is as thick as to hold five people together and very fine in quality.... This stambha was made at the same time as the stupa. The name of the temple is Dharmacakra.... The heretics do not wear clothes but smear ashes on their bodies to serve the Mahādeva. In this temple there are an image of gilt copper and (images of) the five hundred (arhats). In old days in Magadha there was a king called Śilāditya. He made these images. He made a (wheel) of gilt copper at the same time. The dharmacakra does not lack any part measuring exactly thirty *bu* (about 47 m) in circumference. This town (Vārānāsī) is on the northern bank of the Gaṅgā so as to look down on the river. In the territory of the king of Magadha are the Four Great Sacred Stupas (四大靈塔) at the Deer Park here (Sārṇāth), Kuśinagara, Rājagṛha and Mahābodhi. In this country (Vārānāsī) both Mahāyanic and Hinayānic teachings are being held. Thus could I reach the Mahābodhi Temple....

Within a two-month march from here, Vārānāsī, westward one reaches a town of residence of the king of Zhong Tianzhu 中天竺 (Central India), called Kanyakubja. The territory of this Central Indic king is very vast, well-populated and prosperous. The king has nine hundred elephants, each of the other great chieftains (in this country) having two or three hundred. The king customarily fights a battle at the head of his army. He often makes war against the other four regions of India (四天竺) and always wins....

It is in this territory of Central India that there are the Four Great Stupas (四大塔). Three of them are on the northern bank of the Gaṅgā. The first is

in the Anātapiṇḍada Park of Śrāvastī where the monastery, housing monks, is still functioning. The second is in the Āmula Park of Vaiśālī where the stupa is still standing but the temple is desolate without any monks. The third is in the town of Kapilavastu where the Buddha was given birth. The Tree is still existing, but the town has long declined. The stupa is still standing but there are no monks. There are also no inhabitants in the town. This town is located the most northerly of the above three and is left to run waste with bushes and woods, the road being infested with many footpads. Therefore those wishing to go there for worshipping have much suffering. The fourth is the stupa at the Treasure Staircase of Three Courses (at Sāṅkāśya) located between the two Gaṅgās a seven-day march to the west of the town of the Central Indic king.... There is still a temple with monks. ([] represents missing characters in the text and () should be read as supplementing the meanings.)

According to these paragraphs on Central India the king resides in Kanyakubja (Kanauj) ruling a very extensive territory and possessing a force of elephants much stronger than the other four regions; he himself always fights at the head of his army and gains victories over the kings of the others. Lines 41 and following show that his domain includes the locations of the 'Four Great Stupas' at Kapilavastu, Śrāvastī, Sāṅkāśya and Vaiśālī. Unfortunately Huichao does not refer to the name of this great victorious king. On the other hand, he clearly mentions Śīlāditya as a king of Magadha. Since Central India usually includes Magadha, the question has arisen whether the Central Indic king is identical to Śīlāditya.

Stein (1900: I, 89) first identified the nameless king of Central India with Yašovarman which is phonetically equivalent to Yishafamo 伊沙伐摩 in Vol. 221a of the *Tang shu* 唐書. Yishafamo appears there as a king of Central India having sent a Buddhist monk of great virtue to the Tang court which received him in A. D. 731. Since Yishafamo is definitely the same as Yašovarman, Yašovarman was in the position in or before A. D. 731. Otani (1934: 154-156) agrees with Stein, but, strangely enough, prefers Śīlāditya as the better alternative taking into consideration that the king of Central India might not be absolutely contemporary with Huichao. Yet the following discussion proves that Otani's interpretation conflicts with the description by Huichao himself who clearly writes that the king of Central India is comporary with Huichao.

Huichao shows that the Four Great Sacred Stupas at Sārnāth, Kuśinagara, Rājagṛha and Mahābodhi are in the territory of Magadha,

the old domain of Śīlāditya, and the other Four Great Stupas at Kapilavastu, Śrāvasti, Saṅkāśya and Vaiśālī are in Central India under the rule of the Central Indic king. The very same eight stupas were also noted by Wukong about three decades later without dividing them into the two categories. The four main events in the life of the Buddha were the Birth at Kapilavastu, the Enlightenment at Bodhgayā, the First Sermon at Sārnāth and Nirvāṇa at Kuśinagara, as Faxian 法顯 rightly refers to the Four Great Stupas at these four places. But Huichao's Four Great Sacred Stupas excludes the stupa at Kapilavastu, which instead is included in the other category. Therefore, his two categories have no practical significance in Buddhist terms and should be taken as aimed to make clear the distinction between the ancient Magadha territory of Śīlāditya and contemporary Central India. For Huichao the king of Central India has nothing to do with Śīlāditya.

It is the fact that the death of Harṣavardhana Śīlāditya in the late forties of the 7th century caused his domain to split into minor local states and that no imperial unity had been achieved in the northern parts of India until Yaśovarman came to power. The success of Yaśovarman in extending his domain to the Gauḍa country is well-documented in the *Gauḍavaho* by Vākpati and partly documented in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and in the Jain sources such as the *Prabhāvaka-carita*, the *Prabandha-kośa* and the *Bappabhaṭṭasuri-carita*. Only Yaśovarman can be taken as the proper candidate for the Central Indic king whose extensive territory and constant victories are quite clearly recorded by Huichao.

3. Dating Yaśovarman

The date of Yaśovarman has variously been given by scholars: A. D. 728-745 by Smith (1908: 784), some time between the second half of the 7th century and the first half of the 8th century by Pandit (1927:xcv-xcvi), A. D. 725-754 by Tripathi (1937: 195-197) and A. D. 700 (or A. D. 690-740) by Majumdar (1954: 131). Since Huichao arrived at Kucha in late A. D. 727, Smith's hypothesis does not hold well. Tripathi's date of accession, A. D. 725, seems to be based on the fact recorded in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* that it occurred more or less contemporaneously with that of Lalitāditya Mukṭāpīḍa for whom he gives a date from A. D. 724 to 760, as also proposed by Utgikar (Pandit 1927: cclvi-cclx).

The date of accession, A. D. 725, given by Tripathi does not seem appropriate. According to Huichao, the Central Indic king had already expanded his domains when Huichao was in Kanyakubja. For Huichao it took three months from Kanyakubja to a town of king's residence in South India, which might fit Bādāmi of the Chālukyas; two months from there to a town of king's residence in West India, which might be either Alōr or Brāhminābād; three months from the town of West India to Jālaṃdhara; one month from there to Takkadeśa; also one month from Takkadeśa to Xintougula in North India and half a month from Xintougula to Kashmir. From Kashmir he reached Uḍabhāṇḍapura after another month. In total it took eleven months and fifteen days, nearly one year, from Kanyakubja to Uḍabhāṇḍapura. If the durations of stay at each place are added together, the time he spent from Kanauj to Gandhāra much exceeds one year. Based on the fact that Huichao was in Gandhāra from the autumn of A. D. 725 at the earliest, he thus would seem to have stayed in Kanyakubja no later than A. D. 724. Tripathi's hypothesis seems to lose validity.

The above chronology might be valid insofar as we literally accept Huichao's itinerary. A series of doubts arise, however, from the conspicuous difference between the description of the route shown above and that from Jālaṃdhara through Gandhāra and Jibin to Tokharistan and farther. In the latter case the actual route he took can clearly be traced, since he states each city on the route one by one in due order, and it is quite convincing despite the existence of some countries known only by hearsay and the unconvincing locality of Xintougula between Takkadeśa and Kāśmīra. Yet in the case of the routes to South India and from West India and those in South and West India, he does not specify anything about the route and the main city in each part, only saying that after a certain number of months one reaches a town where the king of South (or West) India resides. Nothing of the route he might have taken is referred to. On the other hand, he clearly specifies the names of cities in the case of North and Central India where he must have actually visited, stating that going northward three months or so from a town where the West Indian king lived he reached a North Indian country called Jālaṃdhara (Line 65) and also that he reached a town of Central India's king, called Kanyakubja (Line 21). Also the route he took on the way from Jālaṃdhara to Tokharistan in particular is traceable without a doubt.

All these differences in the descriptions between South and West India, on the one hand, and North and Central India, on the other, may be taken as clues showing that he did not actually visit South and West India, even though he recorded a poem in the section of South India, on lines 57-58, where he is quite moved by coming so far from his homeland. His poem, however, does not include any words to specify the fact that he actually reached South India. I do not think it is going too far to say that Huichao's description about South and West India simply is hearsay. Without seeing South and West India he went from Kanyakubja northwestward to Jālaṃdhara.

If so, the time taken from Kanyakubja through South and West India to Jālaṃdhara, i. e., eight months, should be omitted from total eleven months and a fortnight which was taken from Kanyakubja to Gandhāra. Three months and a fortnight are the time which Huichao spent from Jālaṃdhara to Uḍabhāṇḍapura via Takkadeśa, Xintuogula and Kāśmīra. Although we are left uninformed about how long it actually took from Kanyakubja to Jālaṃdhara, he was in Kanyakubja at least three and a half months earlier than the late autumnal months in A. D. 725. Even if the durations of stay in each town along the route are taken into account, Huichao's stay in Kanyakubja possibly was not in A. D. 724 but in the earlier half of A. D. 725. Until the earlier half of that year, therefore, Yaśovarman may have been finalizing his conquest to widen his political territory.

According to the *Cefu yuangui* 册府元龜 Indian missions, seemingly a joint venture of all Five Indic Regions, arrived at the Tang capital in the 3rd month of Year 3 in the Tianshou era (A. D. 692). The *Tang shu* (Vol. 221a) describes that these missions were received in A. D. 691. Despite no clue as to whether the missions came once or twice, it is believable that both sources refer to the same event. The names of the kings responsible for the missions in each source are common except for some negligible differences in the Chinese characters. The list of kings is as follows:

- (1) Shiluoyiduo 尸羅逸多, the king of West India, restorable to Śīlāditya and maybe identifiable with either Śīlāditya IV of Valabhi or Yuvarāja Śryāśraya Śīlāditya, one of the vice-royalty of Vinayāditya of No. 2.
- (2) Zhelouqi-faluopo 遮婁其拔羅婆 (*Tang shu*), the king of South India, restorable to Cālukya-Vallabha and clearly identifiable with Vinayāditya (681-696) of the Chālukyas of Bādāmi, known as the *virudas* Śrī-ṛiṭhivallabha. The

DATING YAŠOVARMAN OF KANAUJ ON THE EVIDENCE OF HUICHAO 惠超

Cefu yuangui lacks the last character.

(3) Louqi-nuonuo 婁其那那 (*Tang shu*), the king of North India, restorable to Lokeṣ Nana or Lokeṣ Nanna, but unidentifiable. The *Cefu yuangui* lacks the first two characters.

(4) Moluofamo 摩羅伐摩 (*Cefu yuangui*), the king of East India, restorable to Māravarmā or Māravarman, but unidentifiable. The *Tang shu* writes the third character as 'zhi' 枝 instead of 'fa' 伐.

(5) Dipoxinuo 地婆西那, the king of Central India, restorable to Devasena.

The date of the reception of the Indian missions and the regnal years of Vinayāditya lead us to believe that kings in the South Asian Subcontinent are all contemporary. Up to now Devasena has not been known in any other sources in the context of the history of 'Central India' or geographical northern India after the death of Harṣa. Can Dipoxinuo (Devasena) be an epithet of Yishafamo (Yašovarman)? If Dipoxinuo and Yishafamo had been one and the same king, the Tang sources would have selected only one name from the two. Since I believe that Devasena can possibly be taken as distinct from Yašovarman, the existence in A. D. 691 or 692 at the latest of Devasena as the Central Indic king is important for chronologically framing Yašovarman. Evidently Yašovarman came to the throne after A. D. 691 or 692 and was still on the throne in A. D. 731, the date of the Tang's reception of the mission sent under his own name. If the itinerary of Huichao discussed above is right, Yašovarman's accession is datable to some time after A. D. 691 or 692 and before A. D. 725.

As to the Indian missions received by the Tang court after A. D. 691 or 692, the *Cefu yuangui* (Vol. 971) and the *Old Tang shu* 舊唐書 (Vol. 198) describe that the emperor Xuanzong received several missions from Central India during the Kaiyuan era, such as those in the 5th month of Year 5 (A. D. 717), the 1st month of Year 8 (A. D. 720), the 7th month of Year 13 (A. D. 725) and the 10th month of Year 19 (A. D. 731). The last one is attested in the aforesaid *Tang shu* as the mission undoubtedly sent by Yašovarman. Therefore all these missions fall in the above framework between A. D. 692 and 725. Considering the intervals of each mission, the twenty-six year interval between Devasena's mission and the one in A. D. 717 is far longer than the others, such as three, five and six years that seem to represent a series of missions sent by one and the same king. It may be allowed to think, therefore, that Yašovarman came to the throne in some year between A. D. 691/2 and 717, or more

properly, in a year quite close to 717, already gained victory over the vast regions of not only Central India but also Gauḍa by A. D. 725, and still was in the position six years later in 731.

Notes

1. The ancient five divisions of the Subcontinent—Central, East, West, South and North India—as shown in the title *Wu Tianzhuoguo* (Five Indic Regions) do not always correspond to modern geographical divisions. ‘Central India’ covers the area conceived as the center of Indian civilization, or the Gaṅgā-Yamunā *doab*, often including western Bengal. ‘East India’ includes most of Bengal and Orissa, while ‘West India’ covers the middle and lower Indus Valleys and also the area to the southeast of them. ‘South India’ is almost synonymous with the peninsular part of the Subcontinent, and ‘North India’ includes the northwestern part of it extending from Panjāb through northern Pakistan and Kashmir to eastern Afghanistan. The regional denominations of the Subcontinent used below should be read as the same as the above five unless otherwise mentioned.
2. The modern translated versions of the Pelliot 3532 manuscript includes Fuchs 1939, Sadakata 1971, Yang et al. 1984 and Kuwayama 1992.
3. Yoshida (1993: 200) suggests that fudiye may share the original word with a Bactrian word βαροδαιγγο referred to by Davary (1982: 170-171), which appears on the reverses of the coins such as Emissions 244 and 245 (Göbl 1967: III, Pls. 66 and 67). As for the interpretations of the legends, see also Hunbach 1966: 62-63 and Göbl 1967: I, 167-168.
4. The Hu, a Chinese denomination of the western barbarians used by Huichao throughout his record, are not always the Sogdians or Iranians, as has been thought, since it is not acceptable to identify the stock in Gandhāra and in the east of Kashmir with the Iranians.

References

- Davary, G. D. (1982) *Baktrisch, Ein Wörterbuch auf Grund der Inschriften, Handschriften, Münzen und Siegelsteine*, Heidelberg.
- Fuchs, W. (1939) Huei-Ch'ao's 慧超 Pilgerreise durch Nordwest-Indien und Zentral Asien um 726, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, XXX (1938), Berlin, 426-469.
- Göbl, R. (1967) *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien*, 4 vols., Wiesbaden.
- Humbach, H. (1966) *Baktrische Sprachdenkmäler*, 1, Wiesbaden.
- Kuwayama, Sh. (1989) The Hephthalites in Tokharistan and Northwest India, *Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University*, 24, 89-134.
- Kuwayama, Sh. (1991) L'Inscription de Gaṇeṣa de Gardez et la chronologie des Turki-ṣāhis, *Journal Asiatique*, 279, 3/4, 282-283.
- Kuwayama, Sh. (ed.) (1992) *Huichao's Wang Wu-Tianzhuoguo zhuan: Record of*

DATING YAŚOVARMAN OF KANAUJ ON THE EVIDENCE OF HUICHAO 惠超

- Travels in the Five Indic Regions, Translation and Commentary* (慧超往五天竺國傳研究), Kyoto (in Japanese).
- Majumdar, R. C. (1954) Northern India During A. D. 650-750. In R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The Classical Age, The History and Culture of the Indian People*, II, Bombay, Chapter 10.
- Murgotten, F. C. (1969) *The Origin of the Islamic State, being a translation from the Arabic accompanied with annotations, geographic and historic notes of the Kitāb Futūḥ al-Buldān of al-Imām abu-l'Abbās Ahmad ibn-Jābir al-Balādhuri*, Part II, 1st AMS ed. (rep. from the 1924 ed.), New York.
- Otani, Sh. 大谷勝真 (1934) Echō-ōgotenjikkokuden chū no ichi-ni ni tuite 慧超往天竺國傳中の一に就いて (On a Few Problems of the Accounts in *Huichao's Wang Wu-Tianzhuguo zhuan*). In R. Fujita (ed), *Oda-sensei Shōju-kinen Chōsen Ronshū* 小田先生頌壽記念朝鮮論集 (Festschrift for Prof. Oda: Papers on Korea), Keijofu (Seoul), 143-160 (in Japanese).
- Pandit, R. B. (ed.) (1927) *The Gauḍavaho, A Prakrit Historical Poem by Vākpati*, 2nd ed., edited by N. B. Utgikar, Poona (With supplementary notes by Utgikar included in the 2nd ed., cxxxxi-cclxxii).
- Pelliot, P. (1908) Une bibliothèque médiévale retrouvée au Kan-sou, *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient*, 8, 501-529.
- Pelliot, P. (1936) A propos du 'Tokharien,' *T'oung Pao*, 32, 259-284.
- Sachau, E. (1964) *Al Beruni's India*, New Delhi (rep. ed. of the 1st ed., London).
- Sadakata, A. (1971) 'Echō-ōgotenjikkokuden' Wayaku (A Japanese Version of *Huichao's Wang Wu-Tianzhuguo zhuan*), *Tokaidaigaku Kiyō, Bungakubu* (Bulletin of Tōkai University, Faculty of Letters), 16, 3-30 (in Japanese).
- Smith, V. A (1908) The History of the City of Kanauj and of King Yaśovarman, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1908, 765-793.
- Stein, A. (1900) *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī, A Chronicle of Kings in Kāsmīr*, Westminster.
- Takata, T. (1992), Linguistic Aspects of the Wang Wu-Tianzhuguo zhuan and Characteristics of the Dunhuang Manuscript. In Kuwayama 1992, 197-212.
- Tripathi, R. S. (1937) *History of Kanauj to the Moslem Conquest*, Benares.
- Yang, H. et al. (1984) *The Hye Ch'o Diary, Memoir of the Pilgrimage to the Five Regions of India*, L. R. Lancaster and J. L. Shastri (eds.), *Religions of Asia Series*, 2, Berkeley and Seoul.
- Yoshida, Y. (1993) Book Review on Kuwayama 1992, *Oriente*, 36/1, 199-200.