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I. INTRODUCTION

Since 1999 four tombs of Central Asians, mostly Sogdians, have been discovered at Xi’an 西安 and Taiyuan 太原 in China, which provide us with stone funerary couches and house-shaped sarcophagi, decorated with painted reliefs. Each of these tombs contained an epitaph in Chinese or in Sino-Sogdian, which states that these personages were buried at the end of the Northern Zhou 北周 (557-581) or in the early Sui隋 (581-618): Kang Ye 康业 in 571, An Qie 安伽 in 579 (Fig. 1), Shi Jun 史君 (whose Sogdian name was Wirkak) in 580 (Fig. 2) and Yu Hong 魏弘 in 592. Most likely dating to the same period (the last third of the sixth century) are the funerary couches in private and public collections, which are attributed to Sogdians or Central Asians by their subject matter and carving techniques. The varied subjects depicted in the reliefs of these monuments mirror the luxurious life of the deceased, each of whom played an important leadership role in the social or religious activities of his community in China.

In Sogdiana, especially at Panjikent (in present-day Tajikistan), numerous paintings of religious and secular subject matter have been found. Most of them date from the second half of the seventh to the first half of the eighth century when Sogdiana was under the nominal control of the Tang; in contrast, paintings of the sixth century, when Sogdiana was occupied by the Hephthalites and the Western Turks, are few. The reliefs on the Sogdian couches and sarcophagi from China now provide us with abundant examples of the art and iconography of the Sogdians of the sixth century. Equally important, this new evidence for Sogdian imagery has been a source for research about the nomadic Hephthalites, who ruled in Bactria and Sogdiana as well as Xinjiang and northwest India.

Recently, Yutaka Yoshida and Jangar Ya. Il’yasov have expanded our knowledge of the Hephthalite presence in Central Asia through linguistic and art historical analysis, respectively. Yoshida has demonstrated that Zhaowu 昭武, mentioned as a Sogdian surname in documents of the Tang period, is actually a phonetic transcription of the Sogdian čamūk, which is an element encountered in the name of several Sogdian rulers, as well as a city in the History of Buhara. However, he suggests that čamūk is not a Sogdian word or name, but considering the area and the period in which čamūk is attested, čamūk belongs instead to the Hephthalite language.

He discerningly compares the Hephthalite rule in Central Asia with that of the Kushans which covered almost the same region in the first and the second centuries and left a great influence on the languages and Buddhist art in that region. Analyzing a group of terracotta figurines from Chaganian, northern Tokharistan (present-day Sukhandar’ya province, southern Uzbekistan), Il’yasov defines a set of characteristics (to be discussed later on) as Hephthalite.

Inspired by Yoshida’s and Il’yasov’s work, I shall discuss in this paper the possible influence of the Hephthalites on the Sogdians, both in Sogdiana and in China that can be discerned from the Sogdian funerary monuments found in China. To do this, I will focus on two types of crowns represented in the reliefs: a winged crown and a triple-crescent crown. Our knowledge of the Hephthalites is considerably less; for example, we know very little about the various rulers among whom their vast territory was probably divided. Here I will rely on a work of Frantz Grenet, which gives us a new perspective for the Hephthalite occupation in Sogdiana and the resulting influence. Yutaka Yoshida and I are working together on Shi Jun’s tomb inscription and reliefs, and the third part of this paper is based on the results of our collaboration.

II. THE WORK OF GRENET AND IL’YASOV

Using mainly the archaeological evidence from Sogdiana and Bactria, Grenet rejects the traditional view that Sogdiana had suffered from the successive invasions of nomadic tribes, the Huns, Kidarites and Hephthalites, and has shown that the Hephthalites actually contributed to the reconstruction of Sogdian cities. In his view, the Huns left Sogdian cities in ruins, but they quickly recovered in the middle of the fifth century under the Kidarites, and in the first half of the sixth century under the Hephthalites. In these centuries, in fact, Sogdiana saw an increase in its population and the rise of new cities, which prepared the way for the economic and cultural flowering of the seventh century.

Grenet also stresses the contribution of the Kidarites and the Hephthalites for the dissemination of Indian cultural elements into Sogdiana. For example, a goddess painted in the Northern chapel of Temple II in Panjikent, and dated to the sixth century, shows the influence of Hindu art, a consequence of the political
unification of the northern and southern regions of the Hindu Kush accomplished by the Kidarites and the Hephthalites. Some time later, in Panjikent (about 740) a reception hall of a house was decorated with paintings of the epic cycle of Rustam. Boris I. Marshak, who directed the archaeological research at this site, has drawn attention to the head of Rustam, remarkably deformed, and suggested that this image of the hero was borrowed from the royal portraits attested on coins of the Hephthalites, who practiced cranial deformation. Thus, beginning in the sixth century, the period of Hephthalite rule, iconography, that originated with the Hephthalites, along with elements of Hindu art from northern India, entered Sogdiana and persisted there until the eighth century.

Recognition of a “Hephthalite period” in Sogdiana was first proposed in 1971 by A.M. Belenitskii, Marshak’s predecessor at Panjikent, after taking into consideration the evidence of Hephthalite coins, silverwork, and the Panjikent paintings and sculptures. Citing Belenitskii, Il’yasov attributes to the Hephthalite period the group of terracotta figurines from the Surkhandarya region (Southern Uzbekistan) on the basis of their garments—a caftan with a triangular collar on the right-hand—a crown with three crescents, a crown with wings, and a particular hairdo. He further points out that figures with these features are also found elsewhere in Sogdiana, in Bamiyan (in present day Afghanistan), and in Kucha (in present-day Xinjiang), the region that corresponds to the territory ruled by the Hephthalites (Table 1). His observations are significant because he recognizes a political and cultural unification of Central Asia by the Hephthalites behind the diffusion of identical costumes in the region, and refuses to see the direct influence of the Sasanian Empire to the East.

III. CROWNS REPRESENTED IN THE SOGDIAN FUNERARY RELIEFS FROM CHINA

A winged crown and a triple-crescent crown, both of which became prevalent in Central Asia in the Hephthalite period, are associated with some of the figures in the Sogdian funerary reliefs from China. The occurrence of these crowns in sixth-century China enables us to understand further Hephthalite influence among the Sogdians.

1. The winged crown represented on the sarcophagi of Shi Jun and Yu Hong

In 476/477, the Sasanian emperor Peroz introduced as his third crown, one with a pair of wings (Fig. 3a). This crown is attested widely in Central Asia, as shown in Table 1: figurines from the Surkhandarya region (sixth-seventh century), paintings from Sogdiana (eighth century), Bamiyan (mid-sixth century) and Kizil (ca. 500) (Table 1b, f, i, k). Il’yasov has noted that the “diffusion of winged crowns” in Tokharistan and especially in Sogdiana is associated not as much with Sasanian influence as with the Hephthalite expansion. Certainly, from the middle of the fifth to the first half of the sixth century, the Kidarites, followed by the Hephthalites, expanded their power toward the west, forcing the Sasanians to lose control over Sogdiana and Bactria. As is well known, Peroz’s drachms bearing his portrait with a winged crown were paid in large quantities to the Hephthalites, and the latter issued their own coins in imitation of these drachms. Accordingly, it was assumed that Hephthalite kings actually adopted and wore the winged crown, which must have been most familiar for them, although so far there was no evidence for such an assumption.

Recently, Yoshida has convincingly demonstrated that one of the figures with the winged crown on Shi Jun’s sarcophagus should be identified as a Hephthalite ruler. The figure appears in a scene on the right of the northern wall, where Shi Jun visits with his caravan a king seated in a yurt (Fig. 4, 5a, Table 2d). In the art of this period, a figure in a yurt is a standard means of indicating that the individual is a ruler of a nomadic tribe. The funerary couches of An Qie and the Miho Museum have a similar scene of a nomadic ruler who sits in a tent and who, in both cases, can be identified as Turkic by the long hair down his back. In the case of Shi Jun, the ruler in the yurt has a winged crown instead of long hair, which precludes a Turkic origin for him. He cannot be Persian, because the Sasanian king should not be represented in a nomad’s yurt. Yoshida identifies the figure as a ruler of the nomadic Hephthalites, who came under the cultural influence of the Sasanians. Franz Grenet and Pénélope Riboud reached the same conclusion as Yoshida: because shortly after the fall of the Hephthalite empire winged crowns are attested on coins of the “Nezak-shah” dynasty in Kapisa, they propose that the Hephthalites had established this regal fashion. In addition, they point out that Shi Jun’s life (495-579) overlapped with the Hephthalite period rather than with subsequent Turkic rule. This identification of a Hephthalite ruler on a Sino-Sogdian funerary monument is the first evidence that a leader of the Sogdian colony in China had direct contact with a Hephthalite ruler as well as with a Turkic one; it also confirms that among Hephthalite rulers some wore a winged crown. After Peroz, the winged crown was not used for over 100 years by any Sasanian kings until Khusro II in 590, about ten years later than Shi Jun’s burial. Therefore it is certain that Peroz’s crown served as a model for the winged crown of the Hephthalite kings.

In Shi Jun’s relief, we find a second figure with a winged crown (Fig. 4, 5b, Table 2c). This crown, however, is slightly different from that of the Hephthalite ruler previously mentioned, having a pair of wings, a small circle and a crescent in the center. Some identify this person also with a Hephthalite ruler, while others identify him with Shi Jun himself. This figure appears as many as three times as principal figure, twice in banquet scenes and once in a hunting scene. In the banquet and hunting scenes on other Sogdian funerary monuments, it is almost always the deceased who stand out and show off their rich lives. Thus, I agree with the latter interpretation that it is
Shi Jun and not a Hephthalite ruler who wears the second type of the winged crown in these banquet and hunting scenes. This identification suggests that some of the Sogdian leaders in China wore a winged crown; in fact, at least two more examples, confirm that this is so. The first example is Yu Hong, who is repeatedly represented on the panels of his sarcophagus wearing a winged crown (Table 2e). The second example comes from a tomb at Jiulongshan 九龍山, Guyuan 固原, Ningxia 宁夏, discovered in 2003. In it, the deceased was buried wearing a thin gold foil ornament on his head in the shape of a winged crown (now exhibited in the Ningxia Provincial Museum, Yinchuan 銀川, Table 2g). According to Luo Feng, the tomb can be dated to the Sui or Tang period, although no epitaph was found.23 A leader of the local Sogdian community might be the most probable identity for this person who was buried wearing this kind of gold headdress. Recently, through careful examination of the epitaphs belonging to Sogdian immigrants in China, Shōji Yamashita demonstrated that some Sogdians played an important military role in the founding of the Tang dynasty.24 Therefore, it does not seem unlikely that if some of these Sogdian high-ranked military wished to be represented wearing a crown, they would choose the winged one of the Hephthalites, the conquerors of Central Asia.25

Turning to Sogdiana, the iconography of wall paintings, ossuaries and coins all show that the winged crown was the most prevalent crown in the eighth century (Table 1f).25 In a hall of the palace of Dēwāshtīch, a ruler of Panjikent in the early eighth century, was found a small mural fragment representing the very moment that a winged crown is being tied to someone’s head. Both Belenitskii and Marshak assumed that the paintings in this hall depicted the siege of Samarkand by Arab armies in 712 as well as the coronation ceremony of Dēwāshtīch as king of Sogdiana, performed possibly just after the fall of the capital (Fig. 6a).26 If this is so, the crown of a Sogdian king in the early eighth century was a winged crown. In 2003 in Panjikent, a room in a merchant’s residence, dated to the first half of the eighth century, yielded a mural fragment depicting a four-armed King of Demons who wears a crown with a pair of hands and a skull in the center27 (Fig. 6b). This blackly humorous headdress had been invented as a crown for a villain by replacing the components of the winged crown that belonged to a hero or king; this transformation of the winged crown proves that in Sogdiana at this period it was considered a stereotype for the royal crown.

All the images cited above date to the seventh and eighth centuries. However, as pointed out by Il’yasov, the prevalence of winged crowns in Sogdiana should be attributed to the Hephthalites, who took control of the region in the first half of the sixth century and left an important cultural heritage. Thus, already in the sixth century, following the Hephthalite kings, Sogdian rulers seem to have adopted the winged crown. This assumption corresponds well with the evidence that, by the late sixth century, some of the leaders of the Sogdian communities in China wore a winged crown.

2. The triple-crescent crown

As Table 1 shows, we find a figure with a triple-crescent crown and its variation (small ornaments on the crescent) in a terracotta figure from the Surkhkhandar’ya region (sixth-seventh century), in paintings from Sogdiana (seventh century) and Bamiyan (mid-sixth) (Table 1a, e, h). Il’yasov assumes that in Central Asia the triple-crescent crown became popular together with the winged crown under the Hephthalite occupation. In this case, in contrast to the winged crown, numismatic study has confirmed that it was introduced by the Hephthalite ruler, Khingila (ca. 460-490),28 and that its variations were adopted by his successors (Fig. 5b, c).

In 1994, in Jingbian 靖边 (northern Shaanxi, about 120 km to the east of Yanchi 塩池) were discovered a set of tomb gates decorated in relief with a pair of non-Chinese guardians, each wearing a triple-crescent crown (Fig. 7, Table 2a). Although the full archaeological report on this tomb has not yet been published,29 part of the epitaph from the tomb was analyzed by Rong Xinjiang. He identifies the deceased as Di Caoming 翟曹明, who held the title Xiazhou Tianzhu 夏州天主 (“Tianzhu of the Xia region”) and was buried in 579 (Northern Zhou).30 Rong states that the surname Di has generally been considered as that for Dingling 丁零 or Gaoche 高車, but some of those who have the surname Di can be identified as Sogdian. Di Pantuo 翟槃陀 is a good example. He was Xianzhu 襄主 “priest of the Zoroastrian temple” of Yizhou 伊州, and his given name Pantuo is a phonetic transcription of a Sogdian form ﭘﺎﺘﻮ “slave.”31 Next, xian is a graph created in the early Tang period to designate Zoroastrianism. Before its invention the graph Tian 天 “heaven” was used.32 Tianzhu, Di Caoming’s title is, therefore, equal to Xianzhu of the later period, and indicates a Zoroastrian priest. Taking into account the non-Chinese features of the guardians represented on the gates, we can safely identify Di Caoming as Sogdian. Accordingly, we can deduce that the triple-crescent crown, one of the Hephthalite crowns, was known by Sogdians in China already in the middle of the sixth century.

Sogdiana itself has produced examples of triple-crescent crowns, in a painting from Panjikent (Table 1e), on ossuaries and on coins dated to the seventh and eighth centuries.33 It is reasonable to suppose that the triple-crescent crown, together with the winged crown, was introduced into Sogdiana in the Hephthalite period, and it continued to be used until the eighth century, though less frequently than the winged crown.

IV. THE WINGED CROWN AND TRIPLE-CRESCENT CROWN IN CHINA

In the Tang, the winged crown and triple-crescent crown are found in abundance, particularly in crowns of bodhisattvas.34 These two crown types had been seen as evidence of cultural exchange between the East and the West already in 1950’s,
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two countries, it is tempting to assume that the two types of crown has enabled us to posit that the Sogdians in China. This observation, however, requires further research.

As it is impossible to cite all the examples of these two crowns in China, so we will content ourselves to see whether these two types were represented in the Yungang and Dunhuang caves dated to around the first half of the sixth century. Since in this period the Hephthalites expanded their power to Sogdiana and to Eastern Turkistan, it seems probable that the two crowns had penetrated into China in this period (Table 3). At Yungang, there is no example of a triple-crescent crown; at Dunhuang, it is represented in the caves of the Northern Wei (440–534) and of the Western Wei (535–556) (Table 3a, c). On the other hand, the winged crown of the Peroz type is not attested before the Sui period (Table 3d-f).

It is worth referring to a particular type of bodhisattva crown of the Liang period (502–557) on a stele from Chengdu 成都 (Sichuan 四川), which has both elements of the winged crown and the triple-crescent crown39 (Table 3b). The wings at both sides of the crown have been ignored so far, but they are visible in a recently published photograph.40 We know that the Hephthalites had direct contact with the Liang, as they subjected the Tu-yu-hun 吐谷渾 who controlled the route passing through Qinghai 青海.41 In a famous painting of ambassadors attributed to Xiao Yi 簾繹, the fourth emperor of the Liang, an ambassador of the Hephthalite kingdom (Huaguo 滑國) is represented.42 Considering the close contact between the two countries, it is tempting to assume that the two types of Hephthalite crowns served as a model for the composite crown of bodhisattvas from the Liang period. In Central Asia, we have no example of this composite crown. Instead, it appears on An Qie’s couch, worn by a figure who has a long sword on his belt and participates with An Qie in a meeting with a Turkish ruler; however, his nationality has so far not been identified (Table 2b).

In China before the Tang period, winged crowns and triple-crescent crowns are attested mainly in Buddhist art as the crowns worn by bodhisattvas. It is not certain whether these crowns were introduced in China through Buddhist art, since in Central Asia they both, but especially the winged crown, appeared often in non-Buddhist contexts: as the crown of a king or a member of the royal family or the crown of Zoroas-trian gods.43 Apart from Buddhist art, we can presume that these crowns came to China along with the Sogdian immigrants under Hephthalite influence.

In closing, I should like to mention an instance of the winged crown from the early Tang that provides further evidence of its origin in China with Sogdians. It is worn by the royal hunter on the famous brocade preserved in the Hōryū-ji in Nara, Japan and is assumed to have originated in the official atelier of the Tang in the first half of the seventh century. The hunter’s winged crown is shown with a double-square ornament and a crescent with a circle at the center; only one wing is visible44 (Table 10). Components of the crown and its view in profile show a striking similarity to the crown worn by Yu Hong in several scenes on his sarcophagus (Table 2e). Also noteworthy is the Hōryū-ji hunter’s upper garment, which has a frill around the elbow. Figures with similarly frilled garments can be seen on Yu Hong’s sarcophagus (a figure on an elephant who may be Yu Hong or a Hephthalite, a figure on a dromedary (Arabian camel) who may be an Arab and a long-haired Turk on a camel with two humps), and in the Miho Museum’s couch (two figures on an elephant who may be Hephthalites).46 Thus, the model of the Hōryū-ji hunter might not be an image of a Sasanian king attested in silver vessels, as has been generally accepted, but that of royal figures represented by the Sogdians in China. This observation, however, requires further research.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, using new evidence provided by the funerary monuments of Sogdian immigrants in China in the second half of the sixth century, we have attempted to advance Il’yasov’s research, which, through its thorough examination of iconographical material from Central Asia, revealed Hephthalite artistic influence in this territory. Examination of the two types of crown has enabled us to posit that the Sogdians in China had close contact with the Hephthalites and were influenced by them. Further research will be necessary to know more precisely when and how winged and triple-crescent crowns were introduced into China.
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Shanxi Provincial Institute of Archaeology et al., *Tajiyuan Sui Yu Hong ma* [Sui Dynasty Tomb of Yu Hong in Taiyuan] (in Chinese) (Beijing: Cultural Relics Publishing House, 2005), figs. 149, 140, 141, pl. 47, 11, 14. For the identification of the two figures as Arabic and Turkic, see B. I. Marshak and J. C. Y. Watt, “No. 173, Sarcophagus,” in *China, Dawn of a Golden Age*, 276-83. Judith Lerner suggested me the possibility that the figure on an elephant is not Yu Hong but a Hephthalite; Juliano and Lerner, “No. 125, Eleven Panels and Two Gate Towers,” 215, panel I.
Fig. 1: An Qie’s funerary couch. Northern Zhou. 579 CE. Xi’an. After Shaanxi Provincial Institute of Archaeology, Anjia Tomb, pl. 1.

Fig. 2: Shi Jun’s sarcophagus. Northern Zhou. 580 CE. Xi’an. After Wenwu 3 (2005): colour plate.
Fig. 3:


Fig. 4: Northern wall of Shi Jun's sarcophagus, detail from northern wall. Northern Zhou. 580 CE. Xi'an. After Wenwu 1 (2005): 25, figs. 37 and 38.
Fig. 5a and b. Northern wall of Shi Jun’s sarcophagus, detail from northern wall (drawing). Northern Zhou, 580 CE. Xi’an. After Wenwu 3 (2005): 29, fig. 50.

Fig. 6. Wall paintings. Panjikent.
a: Winged crown being tied to the head of a king. Early eighth century. After Azarpay, Sogdian Painting, pl. 24.
b: Demon with a crown with a skull and hands. First half of the eighth century. After Marshak and Raspopova, Otchet o Raskopkakh, colour plate.

Fig. 7. Di Caoming’s tomb gates, detail. Northern Zhou. 579 CE. h. 159cm, l. 127cm. Jingbian (Shaanxi). After Kaogu yu Wenwu 1 (2005), cover.
Table 1: Crowns, costumes and hairstyles attested in iconographical materials from Central Asia, China and Japan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bactria</th>
<th>Sogdiana</th>
<th>Bamiyan</th>
<th>Kucha</th>
<th>China, Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triple-crescent crown</strong></td>
<td><img src="a" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="e" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="h" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="n" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winged crown</strong></td>
<td><img src="b" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="f" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="i" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="o" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triangular collar</strong></td>
<td><img src="c" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="g" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="j" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="k" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hairdo</strong></td>
<td><img src="d" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="l" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="m" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="p" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Crowns, costumes and hairstyles attested in iconographical materials from Central Asia, China and Japan.*

Table 2: *Winged crowns and triple-crescent crowns found in Sogdian funerary contexts in China* [all are on monuments except the gold foil headdress].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winged crown</th>
<th>Triple-crescent crown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Di Caoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jingbian</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Qie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi’an</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xi’an</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Hong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiyuan</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the 6th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyang</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui-Tang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyuan</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e: Yu Hong’s sarcophagus. Left panel in the front. Sui, 592 CE, Taiyuan. After Shanxi Provincial Institute of Archaeology et al., *Taiyuan Sui*, fig. 154.
Table 3: Winged crowns and triple-crescent crowns represented in the Buddhist art of the Northern and Southern Dynasties and the Sui.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Wei</th>
<th>Triple-crescent crown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, c, e-h: Wall paintings, Dunhuang (Gansu). a: Cave 254 (Northern Wei. Second half of the fifth century or first half of the sixth century), c: Cave 285 (Western Wei. 538-539 CE), e: Cave 276 (Sui. Late sixth or early seventh century), f: Cave 380 (Sui. Late sixth or early seventh century), g: Cave 389 (Sui. Late sixth or early seventh century), h: Cave 407 (Sui. Late sixth or early seventh century). From Dunhuang Research Institute ed., <em>Chūgoku sekkutsu, Tonkō bakkōkutsu</em>, [Mogao Caves in Dunhuang] 1-5 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1989-1991), vol. 1, nos. 32, 118; vol. 2, nos. 122, 191, 185, 91.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>