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In the Annals, Nihon Shoki (日本書紀), composed by Prince Toneri and others, and completed AD 720, one of the oldest chronicles in Japan, we read:

(I) April, year 5 of Fakuti (白雉) (AD 654) of Emperor Kōtoku (孝德, reign 645–654)—吐火羅國男二人女二人舍衛女一人被風流來于日向. ‘From the country of Tokwara (吐火羅), two men, two women (and) one šāwe’s daughter (舍衛女), overtaken by a storm, came floating to (the Province of) Fimuka (日向, later Hyūga).’

(II) July 3rd, (1) year 3 (AD 657) of Empress Saimei (齊明, reign 655–661)—覲貨邇國男二人女四人漂泊于筑紫. 言, 臣等初漂泊于海見嶋. 乃以驛召. ‘From the country of Tokwara (覲貨邇), two men (and) four women arrived drifting in (the Province of) Tikusi (筑紫). They said: “We, Your humble servants, arrived first drifting at the Amami Island (海見嶋).” Therefore, Her Majesty received them by courier.’

July 15th, the same year — 作須彌山像於飛鳥寺西. 且設盂蘭盆會, 晏饗觀貨邇人. ‘Her Majesty set up an image of Mt. Sumeru in the west of the Asuka-dera Temple, and held the Buddhist mass of Uranbon (盂蘭盆), (and) in the evening gave feast to the people of Tokwara. Another text reads — Men of Dara (朧羅人).’

(III) March 10th, year 5 (AD 659) of Empress Saimei — 吐火羅人共妻舍衛婦人來. ‘Man from Tokwara (吐火羅), together with (his) wife šāwe’s consort (舍衛婦人), came in homage (to the Empress’ Court).’

(IV) July 16th, year 6 (AD 660) of Empress Saimei — 又觀貲羅人乾豆波斯達阿欲歸本土求請送使囑, 預後朝於大國. 所以, 留妻為表. 乃與數十人入于西海之路. ‘And man from Tokwara (覲貲羅), Kenṣu Fasi Datia (乾豆波斯達阿), desirous of returning to his country, asked for escorts, saying: “I hope I may serve afterwards in Your Court. Therefore, I leave my wife behind as a witness (to it).”’ Then he set out on the way to the Western Sea, together with several decades followers.’
January 1st, year 4 (AD 676) of Emperor Temmu (天武, reign 672-686) — ...... 及舍衛女姿羅女 ...... 損 ...... 及珍異等物進。‘ ...... and the šāwe’s daughter (舍衛女) (and) Dara’s Daughter (姿羅女) ...... brought ...... and novelties and offered (them to the Imperial Court).’

The people referred to in (I) and (II) most probably took a same boat for Japan, but were forced to arrive separately in a shipwreck, one to Fimuka (Hyūga) and the other to Tikusi, west entrance from the Continent to the Yamato Court. Owing to the geographical advantage, the people mentioned in (II) were accepted in prior to those in (I), which acceptance by the Court points to the fact that the people did not belong to a lower rank of community and that they were not the inhabitants of the Tokara (吐喀喇) or Takara (宝) Islands to the south of Kyūshū District.

Concerning the šāwe’s daughter (舍衛女) (I) & (V) whereas in (III) occurring as šāwe’s consort (舍衛婦人), practically all scholars have looked in šāwe (舍衛) Indian city Srāvasti (modern Mahet) to interpret šāwe as ‘woman from Srāvasti’. The city name is familiar with its Chinese rendering 舍衛国 (Shè-wèi guó) or 舍衛城 (Shè-wèi chéng), since a larger number of Buddhist sutras begin with the words: 如是我聞. 一時仏在舍衛國祇樹給孤独園……(9) ‘Thus it was heard by me. At one time, the Blessed dwelt at Srāvasti, in the Jeta-grove (mod. Sahet), in the garden of Anāthapiṇḍada ......’. The capital city of Northern Kosala is thus represented as 舍衛国 or 舍衛城, affixed with 国 (guó) or 城 (chéng) whereas in the Annals Nihon Shoki nowhere is found such a supplement but only 舍衛 which fact has escaped the observation of the scholars concerned.

Next comes the problem of Tokwara (吐火羅, etc.) traditionally identified with Toxārestān, since different identifications have recently been proposed. Prof. Rizō Takeuchi(6) propounded Tokwara-Piāoguó (駕國) identification, referring to the Annals, Xin-tāng-shū (新唐書) which enumerates Shè-wèi (舍衛) among 18 vassals or tributary states of Pyū-guó (Piāo-guó), established by the Pyū tribe with Prome as capital, in the middle district of River Irrawaddy. In somewhat different way was proposed by Prof. Mitsusada Inoue another affiliation of Tokwara with the Kingdom of Dvāravatī which prospered in the lower territory of River Menam. According to him, the Nihon Shoki has on the one hand 吐火羅, 職貨 (貢) 羅 (趙) (I-IV) and on the other 職羅 (II) for one and the same country which resembles the case of ‘Dvāravatī’ represented on the one hand by 吐和羅鉢底, 吐和鉢底, 杜和羅 with voiceless initial and
on the other by 談羅鉄底, 談和羅, 独和羅 with voiced initial whereas 'Toxarestān' is always rendered only with voiceless initial as 吐火羅 (*T'o-hua-la), 賜貨羅 (*To-hua-la), 兜吐羅 (*Tau-k'to-la), etc.(7) And moreover, referring to Prof. Tatsurō Yamamoto's paper(8) pointing out that the Dvaravatī Kingdom had the vassal of Dagon (陀洹 *Da-huan, mod. Rangoon) neighbouring in the west the Tamil (India) and in the north the Pyū-guo, Prof. Inoue expected, through Tokwara-Dvaravatī identification, a reasonable explanation of a closed relationship between the people of Tokwara-Dvāravatī and a woman from Šawe-Śrāvastī (India). Although a remoter distance from Tokārestān to Japan underlies his new proposal,(9) the only arrival to Zhang-an (長安) would clew out the way for the Toxarians to Japan. And we have decisive evidences that Irano-Toxarians came over to Zhang-an, for instance, the Inscription Daqin jìng-jiao liu-hang zhōng-guo bei (大秦景教流行中國碑) (AD 781) in which Mār Yazd-bōzidd, Persian Nestorian, tells us that his deceased father Mīlyēs from Balx, Toxārestān, came over to China to preach to the Emperor. Mīlyēs may be read Mihr-ayās, not Milis as is traditionally read, which reading can afford no meaning whatever.

Accordingly, the traditional identification presents no difficulties, not any more than the new theories recently proposed. The problem rather lies in how Šawe (舎衛) is to be interpreted. When we take it for Śrāvastī (舎衛國), no relation between Śrāvasti and Tokwara (吐火羅, etc.) of the Nihon Shoki seems to be arrived at. Only when the 舎衛女 from the outset pertain to the community of 'the men and women of/from Tokwara', she could embark most naturally with other Tokarians for Japan either from China, from Korea or from the Indochina Peninsula. In fact, when I read the passages concerned from the Nihon Shoki, I could not refrain from the impression that they were all from the same country as one. And if so, 舎衛 is far from place-name. Otherwise, the other men and women must have been provided as well with the places whence they came. The only way, then, to overcome the obstacle is to see in 舎衛 a representation of Middle Persian šāh(10) 'king, petty king'. 舎衛女 as Šawe's daughter means only 'king's daughter' or Middle Persian šāh duxt(ag) which reveals sound and reasonable the traditional identification of Tokwara (吐火羅, etc.) of the Nihon Shoki with Tokārestān.

Now, as far as Tokārestān in the mid 7th century is concerned, it was conquered by Arabs AH 32(11) (Aug. 12, 652 / Aug. 1, 653). Kunduz became residence of Tū-huo-luo Yabgu Wū-sī-bō (吐火羅葉護烏悉波) who governed...
the whole Toxarestān from year 3 of Yōng-hui (永徽) (652) to at least year 2 of Lùn-dé (麟德) (665). Previously Toxarestān had been for some time under the control of the Yabgu Xāyan of the West Türk or Xi-tū-juē (西突厥). Yabgu Tong (統) (reign 617?-630) appointed his eldest son Tardu (咄度) šād (設) of Kunduz whom his own son poisoned to supersede him. The tragedy was met with on his way to India by Xuăn Zàng (玄奘) who saw en route to China again (643) Tardu’s son as Yabgu. The strength of the West Türk, however, after the death of Tong Yabgu gradually decayed to split in half and the ensuing some twenty years saw as many as eight Xāyan at least arising east and west. The West Türk were overthrown in year 2 of Xiān-qíng (顯慶) (657) when Īšbara (沙鉢羅) Xāyan (reign 651–657) was captured by the Chinese general Sū-sī-yē (蘇鬆業) at Tāskant. The rise and decline in their strength must have caused their influence upon Toxarestān to wax and wane. In fact, either from at-Ṭabari or from any other sources we do not know who, shortly before the Arab invasion above referred to, was the Wū-shī-bō’s presumable predecessor as šād or as yabgu in Kunduz from Asina family or else who, at that time, independent or quasi-independent of the West Türk, held the sway over Kunduz. This documentary silence encourages me to reason that the ruler may be rather of Iranian blood, entitled šāh, with whom I should like to affiliate our Datia (達阿) mentioned in (IV). The name ‘達阿’ may date back to Middle Persian ‘Dārāy’, and not to Sanskrit Datta (‘given’) which would have been represented otherwise, most likely, as 達多 and which Datta, however, as personal name affords no meaning. The presumable representation of dār- by 達 came from the Chinese rendering of Skt. dhar-by – 護如 in dharma-by – 護如. How then is to be interpreted the expression 親毗羅人乾豆波斯達阿 in (IV)?

Yazdgerd III, last Sasanid king of kings, was assassinated near Merv in 651. He had two sons, Wahram and Peroz, and three daughters. Peroz, born about 636, came to Zhāng-ān (長安) 670 where he stayed till 673, and is reported to have presented a petition 677 to establish a Zoroastrian temple (Bō-sī-sī 波斯寺). He seems to have died in the late 7th century, whom a son, Naresh (Na-li-sī 泥潰師), survived. Like his father, Naresh contrived in vain to recover Iran from the Arabs and returned defeated to Zhāng-ān in 707.

Now, in regard to the activities of Peroz, Bundahišn(19) tells us thus:

1ka xwadāyīh 'ā Yazdgerd mad 20 'sūl xwadāyīh kard 'ēg Tāzīgān 'pad 'was
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And when the sovereignty came to Yazdgerd (III) and he ruled for 20 years, then the Arabs invaded to Erân-shahr in large numbers. Yazdgerd did not endure the battle with them; he went to Khorâsân and Turkestan, asked horses and men for help, but they killed (him) thither.

Yazdgerd's son went to India, and brought (back) army-and-troop; he went out (uzîd) before coming to Khorâsân; that army-and-troop was disintegrated, and Erân-shahr remained with the Arabs.

The anonymous son of Yazdgerd (III) was convincingly identified with Përôz by E. Herzfeld. For the then about 15-year-old prince Përôz, to cope with the difficulty was too hard and exacting without assistance from some one else with whom I should like to identify (Dârây). The campaign must have set in while Yazdgerd's stay still in Khorâsân, but having heard the death of the king of kings, Dârây escaped from the army-and-troop with his lord, Përôz, and other followers among whom was found most probably his own daughter (合衛女) to seek refuge in Zhang-an. I have translated MP uzîd ('wêyt') 'he went out'. The word is usually employed in the meaning 'he died', but, as derivative from uz-i-, can imply also the meaning 'he escaped, disappeared'. Caused by the preceding 'ôzad, TD2 gives defectively 'wêyt' to be corrected to 'wê<y>t'=uzîd.

Now, let us turn to the difficult expression 観始め乾豆波斯(乾)達阿, which cannot alternatively be explained, as Kengû 乾豆 admits of two interpretations: (1) 乾豆 (*k'ien-dug), seemingly a compromise between 乾篤 (*k'ien-tëk) and 開豆 (*hen-dug), both representing Hindûg(an), points to India. Then we can explain the passage in association with the Bundahišnic one above cited, thus: 'Man from Toxârestân: Persian(22) Dârây who had remained in, or came from, India'. Concerning the expression 'who (had) remained in India', cf. Ardâ Wirâb Nâmag, I:

ud 'pas gizistag Ganâg Mënôg druwand gumân kardan i 'mardmân i 'pad 'ên dên rây 'ân gizistag *Aleksandar i Hâmâyig i Muzrâïg-mânîn wiyâbânê nid

And afterwards the accursed evil Ganâg Mënôg, in order to make men doubtful towards this Religion, deceived that accursed Aleksandar the
Romaean who had remained in Egypt.

Or else, (2) 乾豆 reproduces Kunduz which Persian Dārāy (達阿) as petty king (šāh) most probably governed. The title ‘šāh’, as evident from the below cited inscription in which Šābuhr I’s son Šābuhr as šahryār of Mesene is entitled Maišān šāh, was possessed of by šahryār. If we submit to further reasoning, Dārāy may have been Toxārestān šāh residing in Kunduz — Toxārestān šāh, if nominal and self-appointed. The Annals’ passage then may be explained thus: ‘Man of Toxārestān: Persian(22) Dārāy of/from Kunduz’.

In either case, Dārāy, in all probability, must have helped Pērōz in his campaign to rescue his father, Yazdgerd III, from the difficulties.

From onomastical view-point, the name ‘Dārāy’ (Dārayaw(23) <Old Persian Dārayava<k>u-) betrays his blood royal. He may have been descent from Sasanid king of kings, even if related at a great distance. He, together with his young daughter, 萶術女, and other companions, arrived in Fimuka (Hyūga) AD 654. At that time she, šawe’s daughter, must have been too young for matrimonial life whereas 5 years later, AD 659, ‘man from Tokwara, together with his wife, šawe’s consort, came in homage to the Court.’ Now that there can be found no other woman of noble birth than šawe’s daughter, it is enticing to reason that king’s daughter (šawe’s daughter) herself became king’s consort (šawe’s consort), that is, the daughter was wedded to her own father. This sort of next of kin marriage is called xwedodah (Av. xvaetvadaĮa-) and regarded as highly meritorious. Her father-husband Dārāy left Yamato according to the passage (IV) in July 16th, 660, leaving his daughter-wife behind, who, provided she had had at that time the last chance of conception, must have given birth next year to a child. True to the expectation, a girl was born and named after her father, Dārāy, Dārāy-duxt or Dārāy-duxtag represented as 順羅女 in (V). In January 1st, 676, she, 15-year-old girl, was initiated as adult after the Irainan custom(24) and was accordingly qualified to offer presents, accompanying her mother, 萶術女 (šawe’s daughter) to the Imperial Court. 順羅女 is a half transcription and a half translation of her name Dārāy-duxt(ag), lit. ‘Dārāy’s daughter’. If 順羅女 were not her name, the Annals would have rather called her 達阿女 instead.

Of Dārāy after having left Yamato, nothing is heard from annals either of Japan or of abroad. If his visit to Japan were to ask for help for Pērōz, recovering the throne, his last aim must have ended in failure, because Japan was in a difficult situation in supporting Kudara (百済 — Bek-je) engaged
in a fatal conflict with Shiragi (新羅 — Sin-ra / Sil-ra) supported by the T'ang Dynasty. Another Annals, Shoku Nihongi (続日本紀), Vol. 12, makes mention of the arrival of a Persian Rāmyār (波斯人李密齡) in August, year 8 of Tempyō (天平) (736) of Emperor Shōmu (聖武, reign 724–749), who was vested with rank in November, the same year. But nothing reveals him either Zoroastrian or Manichaean. Unlike him, Dārāy and his daughter-wife were evidently Zoroastrian. '舍衛女' was not her name unlike 達羅女 'Dārāy-duxt(ag)', because, as daughter-wife, she was represented as 妻舍衛婦人 'his wife, šawe's consort or šāh's consort', corresponding to Middle Persian šāh bānüg 'king's consort'. Otherwise, she would have consistently been represented as 舍衛女 'Šāh-duxt(ag)' only.

Of the term 'king's daughter (šāh duxt(ag))' and the personal name 'Dārāy-duxt(ag)', we have foregoing illustrative examples in the Res Gestae Divi Saporis of which, to cite Persian version, 1. 27: šhpuhrduhk<y> ZY myt'n MLK; BRTHk = Šābuhr-duxtag 'i Maišān-'šāh 'duxtag 'Šābuhr-duxtag who (is) Maišān-šāh's (Maišān-king's) daughter' whereas in 1. 23 is read šhpuhr ZY myt'n MLK: = Šābuhr 'i Maišān-'šāh 'Šābuhr who (is) Maišān-king'. From these expressions we learn that the daughter of Šābuhr (son of Šauhr I) was named after her father. Hence the name 達羅女 Dārāy-duxt(ag) can easily allow us to infer that her father was Dārāy represented as 達阿. Scholars have agreed in taking unreasonably 達羅 for 吐火羅, 親貨遜, or 親貟羅. If so, why the country-name represented by three characters was abruptly transcribed with two characters 達羅? 達羅女 cannot be other than Dārāy-duxt(ag). The text (II) has a seemingly variant reading 'Another text reads Men of Dara (達羅人)', whence scholars have reasoned that 達羅 is 吐火羅. The interpretation however is far from convincing, since 達羅人 is an annotation on the foregoing words 親貨遜 and therefore means only 'Dārāy's fellows, followers, companions'. The compilers must have mistakenly taken the annotation for a variant. Rather the annotation points to Dārāy's leadership of the company. Throughout the Annals, there is no explicit statement either of Datia 達阿 (Dārāy) as šawe 舍衛 (šāh 'king'), or of his blood relationship with the 舍衛女 (šāh duxt(ag) 'king's daughter'), or of his marriage with her. If in (III), 吐火羅人 'man from Tokwara / Toxärestān, were added with 達阿, no difficulties would take place. Notwithstanding, (III) has only 吐火羅人, and who is the Tohärian is periphrastically hinted at in the following (IV) by 親貟羅人乾豆波斯達阿. The silence in the Annals concerning the marriage does not mean that from
the surroundings was concealed the connexion which, as highly meritorious deed, had no reason to be so treated. The description in the Nihon Shoki, though chronologically ordered, is lacking in grasping the true nature of the historical events. As is evident from (II) where ‘Men of Dara / Dārāy’ is taken for a variant of ‘people of / from Tokwara / Yoxārestān’, the compilers failed in fundamental treatment or understanding of the materials from different sources. Be that as it may, the Nihon Shoki records an official arrival of Iranian Zoroastrians in the Yamato Court.

Notes

(1) The date ‘July 3rd’ most likely refers to their arrival in Yamato as inferred by Mitsusada Inoue: “吐火羅・舍衛考” in 立正大学史学会創立三十五周年記念論文集, Tokyo 1960, p. 42.
(2) Jirō Maruyama (apud Inoue: op. cit., p. 46) identified Tokwara with the Tokara / Takara Islands.
(4) In this paper, Chinese expressions are all given according to 新华字典 (Xinhua zìdān), Peking (Beijing) 1971, in Italic type, except those subjected to particular treatment which are given, asterisked, according to Akiyasu Todo (ed. by): 署名の字大字典 (Shūmei no kana daizidian), Tokyo 1978.
(5) Sanskrit text reads: evam mayā śrutam. ekasmin sāmaye Bhagavān Śrāvaṇyāṁ viharati sma Jetawane ‘nāthapiṇḍadādayārāma ......
(9) Inoue: op. cit., p. 41.
(10) East Iranian term for ‘king’ is xšāw, ixšād (Sogdian), but ‘šāh’ is also possessed of. See Ar. Christensen: L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen 1944, p. 501.
(12) In his letter to me dated June 9, 1978, Prof. Kazuo Enoki, citing T'ai-p'ing huán-yú ji (大平寰宇記), Vol. 186, and T'āng hui-yao (唐會要), Vol. 99, pointed out that Wū-sīhī-bō 烏泥波 was Tū-hū-dū (呂後) Yabgu 吐火羅業護 in year 3 of Yōng-huī (永暦) (652), that he residing at Kunduz as capital ruled over the whole Toxārestān which later, in June, year 1 of Lóng-shū (龍澍) (661) was divided into 25 (!) guo (國) and that in year 2 of Lín-dé (麟德) (665) he dispatched his own younger brother Zā-hē-duō (祖乾度) to tribute mā-nū (and) dēng-shū (登樹) (馬腦陳樹), each as high as over 3 chǐ (尺), to the T'āng Court. See also note 14. His letter will be referred to at greater length in my work ペルシア文化渡来考—シルクロードから飛鳥へ、Tokyo 1980, pp. 32–34. My heartfelt thanks are due to Prof. K. Enoki.
(13) See Dè-táng dà-chén-sì sān-cáng fù-hū-chūn (大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師伝), Vols. 2 & 5; and Shinji Maejima: 玄奘三蔵, Tokyo 1952, pp. 31–32.
(14) Prof. Enoki in his letter above mentioned states: “Who was Wū-sīhī-bō’s predecessor
and in what relation did he stand with Wu-shi-bo cannot be ascertained from the historical materials extant (or those examined by me).” See note 12.

(15) Christensen: op. cit., p. 508.

(16) E. Herzfeld: *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, Bd. IX, Heft 2, Berlin 1938, p. 94, n. 3.


(19) TD1, 185: 6–12 (TD2 216: 1–8 is defective).

(20) Herzfeld: loc. cit., n. 2.

(21) Cf. note 16.

(22) Now, 波斯 is ‘Persia, Persian’ and not Bō-hi (Posei) in the Malay Peninsula.


(24) Strictly speaking, Iranian New Year falls on the vernal equinox.

(25) The sixty-year-old* but irrelevant theory that he was a Nestorian physician is based on MS variant 李密醫 to be rejected by the oldest reading 李密醫 of the Kanazawa Bunko Library MS. Moreover the theory is not onomastically tenable. Were he a physician as the theory insists it, he would have been represented as 李密醫 ‘Physician Rimitu (Lī-mīl)’. In our further reasoning, he seems rather to be Manichaean who fell a victim to some Zoroastrian slanderers, since the Shoku Nihongi makes no mention of his name any further.


(26) Motoharu Fujita (apud Inoue: op. cit., pp. 46–47) interpreted it as ‘woman (婦人) from Mesae (麥食衛)’, identifying Mesae with the Visayan Islands, Philippin.