CHAPTER I

THE KUSĀNAS

I. Nomenclature

1. Various spellings

We find the word Kuśāṇa used in different ways in the old Chinese chronicles and in the inscriptions. Kharosthī inscriptions spell the word as Kuśara or Kuśara. Panjtar inscription of the year 122 and Manikiala inscription

of the year 18 spell it as Gusana while the Taxila silver scroll inscription of the year 136 spells it as Khusana.

On the coins the following forms of the word occur in Kharosthi legends; Kusana and Khusana.

In the Greek legends, which the Kusana coins bear, the word is represented as Khos-ansu, Kos-ano, Kors-ano.

Kosano

Brahmi inscriptions mention the word as Kusana.

Coins of the Sassanian rulers also used this form.

GT p. 52-53.
3. NC, 3rd series Vol XII, for 1892 pl XIV, 3.
5. BMC p. 174; PMC p. 85; AK P. 25.
6. BMC pl XXVI, 4-18; pl XXVII 8-24, pl XXVIII 1-32;
pl XXIX 1-4; IMC p. 69; EII pl XII, 9; JNSI Vol. VIII. P. 60.
7. IMC. P. 64.
9. ASIAR for 1911-12 pp 120 ff; pl 53; EI Vol XXI p. 59; JRAS for 1914 pp 370, 375, 1000.
10. Names of the Sassanian kings like Hormizd Shapur and Varahran are found in Greek script as Shao nano Shao Koshano.
In Kharosthī documents of Central Asia the forms used are Kiisana and Kusana.

Therefore, it is clear that the word Koei shuang of the Chinese annals is the same as Gusa or Kusana in the Kharosthī and Kuśāṇa in the Brāhmī scripts.

2. Significance

The Chinese annals and the inscriptions of the Kuśāṇas have used the term Kuśāṇa with different meanings, namely:

1) As a principality or a kingdom.
2) A clan or a sept.
3) A dynasty.
4) Personal name of the ruler of the dynasty.

Tsien-Han-Chou and Héou-Han-Chou mention the word Kuśāṇa as one of the five principalities. The two annals have clear indications about the way the word Kuśāṇa came to be associated with these meanings.

Tsien-Han-Chou states:
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"They (the people of Ta-hia) have five
principalities, each under one Hei-hou (chieftain), Heiou-mi with the capital Ho-mo, shuang-mi with the capital
shuang-mi, Kouei-shuang ( Kuśāṇa ) with the capital Hu-tmao, Hi-touen with the capital Po-Mao and Kao-fu with the capital Kao-
fu. These five Hei-hous (chieftains) are all dependent on the Ta-Yue-chi."

Heou-han-Chou describes the division of the Ta-Yue-
chi into five principalities and states: 1

"When the Yue-chi were conquered by the Hioung-nou,
they went among the Ta-hia, divided their kingdom into five
principalities, which were, "Heiou-mi, Choang-mo, Koei-
choang, Hi-tun, Tbu-mi." The annals further state that the
chief of the Koei-choang principality subjugated other four
principalities, "About a hundred years afterwards, Kieou-
tsieou-Kio ( Kujula Kadphises), the prince of Koei-choang
( Kuśāṇa ), attacked and subdued the other four principalities
and constituted himself king ( wang ) of a kingdom which was
called Koei-choang ( Kuśāṇa ). This prince invaded the
country of the A-si ( Pathia); he seized upon the territory
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of Kao-fou (Kabul), destroyed also Po-ta and Ki-pin, and became completely master of those countries. Kieou-tsieou-k'io died at eighty years; his son Yen-Kao-tchin ascended the throne; he conquered Tien-tchou (India), and appointed generals there, who governed in the name of the Yue-chi."

Therefore, it is clear from the two Chinese annals that the Kušāṇa had originally been a name of a principality of the Ta-yue-chi in Ta-hia. Kujula Kadphises identifies himself with the name Kušāṇa. After subjugating the four principalities and other parts of the country he established himself as the king of an extensive territory, which became widely known as Kušāṇa kingdom. The title Kos'ano used in coin legends by Kujula Kadphises, Kaniska, Ḫuviska and Vāsudeva refers to the fact that his dynasty was, therefore, aptly termed the
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Kuṣāṇa dynasty. Panjtar inscription of the year 122, Taxila 2 silver scroll of the year 136 and the Mat inscriptions used the word as a personal appellation or surname without mentioning the name of the king for whom it is meant. According to Thomas the word denotes only a dynastic title. But this word has expressed four different senses in different contexts.

3. Identification with Kujula Kadphises

According to K.P. Jayaswal the words Kuṣāṇa (m) = putr (Q) can be identified with Wema Kadphises, son of Kujula Kadphises. Here he has taken the word as personal name of Kujula Kadphises. He further gives examples i.e. the words Mahārāja Gusana and Mahārāja vajātipāla Kuṣana and suggests the words Gusana and Kuṣana as the name of Kujula Kadphises. In the Chinese annals we find 'Kuei shuang wang' and in coin
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1. It is Kaneaki Kosano. K.P. Jayaswal translated these as 'King Kusāṇa' and 'Kaniska, the descendant of Kusāṇa'. But Sinologists contradict K.P. Jayaswal's conjecture and suggest that Kusāṇa (m)-putr(o) means a scion of the Kusāṇa dynasty and Kaneaki Kosano means Kaniska, the Kusāṇa.

4. Theories about other names of the Dynasty

The Chinese translation of a Buddhist work mentions Kusāṇa as the name of the dynasty. Kusāṇa has led some scholars to conclude that Kusāṇa or Kusa was the name of a dynasty. But in another Buddhist work Kalpadatikā, the name of the dynasty is not available.

In Mahārāja Kanika lekha, Kaniska has been related with Kusa race, and Mahārāja Kanika and Matrcheṭa have been identified with Mahārāja Kaniska and Aśvaghosa. Sanskrit version of the
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letter is lost while Tibetan version of the same is available. But Matrtha and Asvaghosa were altogether different persons.

Baron accepts Kusa as a name of the dynasty. He takes the word Kusana as a genitive plural of Kusa which he identifies with the Chinese word 'Yue-chi'. Sten Konow and Bhaskar Chattopadhyaya have supported Baron. If we agree with him then the meaning of the words Gusanasa and Kusnanasa will be 'Shah of Gusas' and 'Shah of Khusas' respectively. But it should be noted that in Kharosthi script s and s are distinct letters. Therefore, it is difficult to identify the word Kusa with the Chinese word Yue-chi. Therefore it is only a conjecture. Baldev Kumar has accepted the form of the name as Kusana or Kusana not Kusa.
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II. Nationality: Various theories

The nationality of the Kuśāṇa has always remained a point of controversy among the scholars. On the grounds of physical features, dress and language, they have been assigned to different nationalities.

(1) Turkish Theory

Kālhaṇa, in his Rajataranginī has mentioned Kaniska and his successors as Turushkas or Turks. According to Alberuni Kanika (or Kaniska) was the scion of the well-known Turkish Shahiya family, who had their seat of government at Kabul. He described Bāhka-tatkin, the founder of the family, as being dressed like a Turk with a short tunic open in front, a high hat, boots and arms.

Some scholars find their support in the Kuśāṇa coinage where the Kuśāṇa kings are dressed like Turks. Mr. Kennedy describes, “Kanishka calls himself a Kushan, and his coins represent him as a powerfully built barbarian king, clad in the loose coat and huge boots which were the common dress of
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Turkestan. The Tochārī belonged to the great Turki family, and Kanishka's features are characteristic of his race. He has the pointed cranium, the salient cheek bones, the large, long and heavy nose, the thick beard. Wilson supports Kennedy and describes "He wears a conical cap, turned up at the sides, a tunic close to the body over which is a sort of straight coat: boots are invariably worn. The features are not those of the Mongol but of the Turks." Levi has found a passage in Abhidhâna Chintamani that Turks were Sakhas and he further tried to identify the royal title Shah used by the Kusānas in their inscriptions with Sakhi, the royal title of the Turks. Hirth identifies the title Yavuga with Turki Jabgu while Wulfingh compares the word with Turki Gujlu. Cunningham also supports the Turkish nationality of the Kusānas.
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A Buddhist monk Oukong refers to the use of Turkish titles by the kings of Gândhāra and Kabul in 753 A.D. and he considers them to be the descendants of the Kuśāṇas.

2. Saka-Iranian theory

Sten Konow rejects the theory that Kuśāṇas were the Turks. He finds his support in the statement of Joyce who states: "A white-rosy race; very brachycephalic; stature above the average; with thin prominent nose, varying from aquiline to straight; long oval face, hair brown, usually dark, always abundant and curly; eyes medium in the main."

Further we find Joyce's statement about the population of Ta-hia "The Majority of the peoples surrounding the Taklamakan desert have a very large common element seen in its purest form in Wakhi. The fact that the Wakhi display so close a relationship with the Gālcha proves that the basis of the Taklamakan population is Iranian."

3. Sten Konow questions the Turkish origin for the title and designation Yavuga and Kulula. He identifies the
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title Yavaua with old Saka title jauva or zaüva used by Saka Patika. For the title Kujula, Sten Konow supports Lüders who takes it as the name of a class or a race. Konow also has suggested that terms and designations used by the Kusana are connected with the Iranian language. He states;

"That several terms and designations used by them (the Kusana) find their explanation in an Iranian language, which was once spoken and used in literature in parts of Chinese Turkistan and only in it."

Professor Leumann calls this language North-Aryan whereas Pelliot takes it as an East Iranian language. Kirste suggests it to be a Khotani language. But Lüders is certain that the language is Sakish. Sten Konow suggests that the word 'Marjhaka' stands for the Saka word 'Malysaki' and 'Shao' is a Saka word for 'King'.
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Grousset is also of the view that the physical appearance of the people of Tarim basin is very similar to the Iranian variety of Caucasian. He further states that Chinese travellers of antiquity and the early Middle Ages have left similar pictures of these people. He also finds confirmation of the ethnographical evidence in the results yielded by excavations which show that "upto the 9th century A.D. the people of Turfan, Karashahr, Kucha and Kashgar spoke not Turkish but purely Indo-European languages closely related to Iranian, Sanskrit and other European languages."

3. Tibetan Theory

McCrinle accepts the Kusānas to be of Tibetan nationality. K.P. Jayaswal considers the Kusānas as foreign rulers in India with their capital in Bactria.

We see that the views about the nationality of the Kusānas cannot be regarded as definite. While considering their nationality the scholars have seldom tried to make distinction between the word race and nationality. Language is not a criterion for fixing nationality. As regards the

1. AIP. p 138
2. AIP. p.138
3. HIJ pp.41-54
shape of the skull and other racial characteristics, speculation is based only on coin portraits; no skull assignable, with certainty, to any Kusāṇa ruler has come down to us. It is, therefore, highly arbitrary to fix their race on such dubious evidence. Turks came into prominence long after the Kusāṇas. It is illogical to give Kusāṇas a Turkish origin simply because they happened to rule over the country that came under Turkish sway at a later date.

Now where the Kusāṇas have regarded Iran or Tibet as their homeland. Therefore, it is not possible to accept either Sten Komow or K.P. Jayaswal.

4. Conclusion

To fix the real nationality of the Kusāṇas it is necessary to go through the relevant passages of the Chinese annals. T-sien-Han-Chou describes the five principalities, all dependent on the Ta-Yue-Chi and Heou-Han-Chou describes the division of the Ta-Yue-Chi kingdom into five principalities. But both the annals have mentioned the term Kusāṇa as one of the five principalities.

1. KSIU pp.143, 150-51, 178-79.


4. TiC Kouei-Shuang; HHC Kouei-Choang.
Hence it is safe to conjecture that the Kuśāṇas belonged to the Ta-Yue-chi who settled themselves in Bactria in the second century B.C. leaving their original home-lands in the modern Kanū province of China. The Kuśāṇa rulers gradually became Indianized till they adopted purely Indian names, like Vasudeva.

III. Kuśāṇas - Parent-Stock and Origin

Parent-Stock and Origin

The Kuśāṇas were a branch of the Ta-Yue-Chi tribe that migrated from its original habitation beyond the north-western frontiers of China and settled in Bactria.

1. Original Home

Reports of the travels of Chang Kien as recorded in the Chinese historical annals, Sse-Ki, describe the Yue-Chi to be the dwellers of the area between Tun-hwang and Ki-ūen. "In olden times they relied on their strength, and thought lightly of the Hiung-nu; but when Hau-tun ascended the throne he attacked and defeated the Yue-Chi unto the time when Lau-shang, shan-yü of the Hiung-nu, killed the king of the Yue-Chi and made a drinking vessel out of his skull, the Yue-Chi had lived


2. Chang Kien was a traveller who was sent by Chinese Emperor Wu-ti, on a mission to the Yue-Chi in 126 B.C.
between Tun-huang and the Khliev". The Shi-Ki-Cheng-i quotes authority to show that the old country of the Yue-Chi comprised Liang-Chou (Modern Wu Wei), Kanchou (Modern Chang Yeh), Su-Chou (Modern Chiu Chuan), Kue Chou and Sha Chou in the Kansu province of China.

2. War with the Hiuung-nu. Defeat and migration

The Yue-Chi were used to wandering hither and thither like their neighbours, the Hiuung-nu, the Hupas of the Indian records. Originally the Yue-Chi were stronger than the Hiuung-nu, but Mao-Tun, the chief of the Hiuung-nu, defeated the Yue-Chi in 176 B.C., and informed the Chinese Emperor accordingly.

The successor of Mao-Tun, Shen-Yu-Leh shang, again defeated the Yue-Chi, killed their king and made a drinking
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4. SK chap 123 fol.4; IA/1905 p.75
5. IA for 1919 p.70.
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bowl out of his skull. Lāo-shang ruled from 174 B.C. to 160 B.C. And in about 165 B.C. he defeated the Yue-Chi.

However, the two Chinese annals differ in their account about the migration of the Yue-Chi to Ta-hia.

3. Sse-Ki further gives the following account about the migration of the Yue-Chi:

"--- but when they (the Yue-Chi) were beaten by the Hiung-nu, they fled to a distant country and crossed to the west of Yuan (Ta-Yuan), attacked Ta-hia (Bactria) and conquered it."

Memoirs of Chang-Kien as recorded in Tsien Han-Chou give more details:-

"When I was living among the Hsiung-nu, I heard that the king of the Wu-Sun was called K'un-mo. K'un-Mo's father, Nan-tou-mi, originally lived together with the Great Yueh-Chih between Ch'ih-lieu and Tun Huang. It was a small country. The great Yueh-Chih attacked and killed Nan-Tou-mi and took away his territory. The people fled to the Hsiung-nu.

------------------------------
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The son, K'un-mo, was newly born. His guardian, Pu-Chiu Hsi-hou (=Yabgu), ran away carrying him and set him down in the grass to look for food for him. When he returned he saw a wolf suckling him; also a crow carrying meat in its beak, hovering by his side. He thought him divine and brought him to the Hsiung-nu. The Shan-Yü loved him and brought him up. When he was full grown, the Shan-Yü gave K'un-mo his father's people, and put him in the command of troops. He frequently won distinction."

"At the time the Yüeh-Chih had already been defeated by the Hsiung-nu and had gone west and attacked the king of the Sakas (Sai Wang). The king of the Sakas fled south and moved for away and the Yüeh-Chih occupied his territory. Having become strong, K'un-mo asked the Shan-Yü to be allowed to take vengeance for his father. So he went west and attacked and defeated the Great Yüeh-Chih. The Great Yüeh-Chih again fled westwards. They moved to the land of Ta-hia."

3. Conquest of Ta-hia

After being defeated by the Hsiung-nu, the Yue-Chi fled westwards and conquered Ta-hia. Sse-Ki records some account of the migration and their conquest of Ta-hia.

----------------------------------------
"When they were attacked by the Hsiung-nu, they went far away and over in the west, beat the Ta-hia and overthrow them. After that they established princely courts there." (Tsien-han-Chou)

In we find the following account about the conquest of Ta-hia:-

"They (the Yue-Chi) invaded the country of their neighbours, the Wu-Sun- and killed Wu-Sun king, Nam-teou-mi The son of Nan-teou-mi, Keen-mouo (Kwen-mo) moved westwards and attacked and defeated the Yüeh-Chih. The Yüeh-Chih fled still further to the west to the valley of the Wei (Oxus or Amu Darya), overthrow Ta-hia and established their capital to the north of the river."

In Sse-Ki the description of Ta-hia is given as follows:

"Ta-hia (Bactria) is more than 2000 li to the south-west of Ta-Yuan (Ferghana), on the south bank of the K'ui-Shui (Oxus). The people have fixed abodes and live in walled cities and regular houses like the people of Ta-Yuan.

---

1. SM chap 123 fol.4; ESM pp 200 ff; IHQ for 1929 p.51. 2. TiC BK 61; ESM pp 200 ff; JRAS (NS) for 1882 p.82; IA 1905 pp 75-76; 1908 pp 25-26. 3. One li = 3 mile; CYIT vol II p.337
They have no great king or chief, but everywhere the cities and towns have their own petty chiefs. While the people are shrewd traders, their soldiers are weak and afraid to fight, so that, when the Ta-Yue-Chi migrated westward, they made war on the Ta-hia, who became subject to them. The population of Ta-hia may amount to more than a million. Their capital is called Lan-shi, and it has markets for the sale of all sorts of merchandise. To the south-east of it is the country of Shôn-tu" (India).

Tsien Han-chou confirms the description as recorded in Sse-ki and states,

"The Yue-tchi went very far away, passed beyond Ta-Wan (Ferghana), fought the Ta-hia in the west and subdued them. Their chief then fixed his residence north of the Wei (Oxus) river. The Ta-hia had no sovereign or chief magistrate, each city (Ville), each small town (bourgade), was governed by its magistrate. The people were weak, and afraid of war. When the Yue-chi arrived, they submitted to them."

1. BF p.9, 27; C.II Vol II Pt. I P. lv
2. chap 123 Tr. by Hirth 'The story of chang kiem
china's pioneer in Western Asia' pp. 89-152;
JAOS Vol 37 1917 p.97-98.
3. ThC BK 61, passage translated by speeht in JA 1883 p 322;
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4. Date of conquest of Ta-hia

Before arriving at any conclusion about the date of the conquest of Ta-hia by the Yue-Chi, we have to go into the circumstances of the period.

(1) We find that in B.C. 140 Chinese Emperor Ou-ti (140 B.C. - 86 B.C.) sent Chang Kien to the Ta-Yue-Chi. On his way he was arrested by the Hiung-nu. He managed to escape after ten years (in about 128 B.C.) to Ta Yüan (Ferghana) and then he was taken to the Ta-Yue-Chi, who were settled in Ta-hia by that time. Being unsuccessful in his mission, Chang Kien returned to China in 126 B.C. and reported to the king that the Yue-Chi had subjugated Ta-hia completely and had no idea to shift from there.

(2) We find in Tsien-Han-Chou that the Wu-Sun attacked the Yue-Chi. It might have happened just at or after the death of the Mao Tun's successor Shan-Yu who reigned from 174 B.C. to 160 B.C. On the basis of the account recorded in Tsien Han Chou Fujita Toyohashi and Sten Konow suggest that Yue-Chi conquered Ta-hia in 160 B.C. But it is clear that at the time

1. THC BK 61; JAI Vol X for 1881 pp 60 ff; C II Vol II Pt.I p liv; IA for 1903 p.418; 1905 p.767.
2. THC BK 61; JAI Vol X for 1881 pp 60 ff; C II Vol II Pt.I p liv; IA for 1903 p.418; 1905 p.767.
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4. Ibid
of the defeat of the Wu-Sun, Kun-mo, the Wu Sun chief, was almost a new-born child and his father died near about 160 B.C. so it is evident that 160 B.C. is not the date of the defeat of the Yue-Chi. We should allow Kun-mo at least 20 to 25 years to grow to full manhood to lead a victorious army against the powerful Yue-Chi. Thus it may be concluded that the Yue-Chi were driven out towards Ta-hia in or about 135 B.C.

The Yue-Chi might have taken sometime to completely subjugate Ta-hia. And this work should have been easily completed before 126 B.C. when Chang-Kien found them in their new country Ta-hia.

According to Specht the date of conquest of Ta-hia is A.D.24. He suggests that there is no mention of this incident in Tsien Han Chou. But he is not correct, because we do find therein a passing reference to this conquest.

According to Rapson the Sakas occupied Ta-hia in 135 B.C.

In support of his view he produces the statement of Ma-Twan-lin, a Chinese encyclopaedist: "In ancient times the Hlung-nu

1. ThiC BK 61; IA for 1903 p.419.
2. JA for 1883 p.324
3. ThiC BK 61
4. CHI Vol I p.566
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defeated the Yue-Chi, the latter went to dwell in Ta-hia and
the king of the Sai (S'akas) went southwards to live in Ki-
pin. The tribes of the Sai divided and dispersed as to form
here and there, different kingdoms." From this statement it
is clear that S'akas were living in Ta-hia and the Yue-Chi
drove them out. Dr. M.V.D. Mohan, too, dates the subjugation
of the Greeks and occupation of Bactria by the S'akas in
135 B.C. This view is confirmed by the evidence of Strabo,
who refers to the occupation of Bactria by the S'akas.

According to Tarn Mithridates I defeated Heliocles,
the last Greek king of Bactria, in 141 B.C. The Yue-Chi must
have reached Ta-hia after 141 B.C. as Ta-hia was not under one
chief when Heliocles was defeated. But Justin's statement on
which he based his conclusion merely refers to the defeat of
Bactrians by the Parthians and from the context it appears that
he is referring to an event of a much later period.

1. MWA pp.191-92
2. GBI p.283
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4. MNI pp.187-88
5. Division of Ta-hia into five principalities.

We are told by the Chinese sources that after occupying the whole of Ta-hia, the Yue-Chi divided it into five principalities which are individually named in the two Chinese annals. Heou-Han-Chou gives the names of the five principalities as Hieon-mi, Shuang-mi, Koei-Choang, Hi-touen and Tou-mi. Tsien-Han-Chou mentions the names as Hieon-mi, Shuang-mi, Koei-Shang, Hi-touen and Kao-fu. Fan-Ye, the author of Heou-Han-Chou, names the fifth principality as Tou-mi instead of Kao-fu. It was in fact occupied by the Yue-Chi only after the conquest of A-si (Parthia).

Marquart identifies Hieou-mi with Wakhan; Shuang-mi with Chitral; Koei-choang with the country immediate to the north of Gandhāra or with Gandhāra itself; Hi-touen with Parwan or Panjshir and Kao-fu with Kabul. But his thesis is not tenable, since he excludes Ta-hia or Bactria from the Yue-Chi dominions, and includes Kabul in them. But all

1. HHC chap 118 Tr. by specht JA for 1883 p.323; THC chap 96a fol 15
2. HHC chap 118 Tr. by specht JA for 1883 p.323
3. THC chap 96a fol 15; JA for 1883 p.323; JA I for 1883 pp 20-23; JAOS for 1941 p.243.
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evidence reproduced above clearly establishes the fact that at that time Ta-hia was under the Kusanas while Kabul was not.

6. Kusanas established supremacy over the five principalities.

Hao Han-Chou records that the Koei-shouang conquered the other four principalities. It states:

"at first the Yue-Chi were overthrown by the Hlung-nu. They removed their settlements to Bactria and divided the kingdom into five, putting a Hi-Hou the head of each division. A century later the Hi-Hou of Kuei shuang attacked and overthrew the four other Hi-Hou. He assumed the rank of Prince (wang) and bore the dynastic title of King of Kuei-shuang (Kusana). He pressed into A-si (Parthia) and took the province from Kao-fu. He annihilated Pu-ta and Kipin, all this formed his realm. When K'iu Tsiu K'in was 80 years old, he died, his son Yen-Kao-Chou, became prince. He thereupon conquered India, and placed a deputy there. The Yue-Chi who governed the country thereupon became extremely rich and flourishing, in all countries they were designated as Kings of Kuei shuang; the Chinese, however, retained the old name of Yue-Chi."

---

1. HHC chap 118, fol V; IA for 1906 pp.38f.