

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Ttaugara

Author(s): H. W. Bailey

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (1937), pp. 883-921

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](http://www.cambridge.org) on behalf of the [School of Oriental and African Studies](http://www.soas.ac.uk)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3488482>

Accessed: 20/12/2012 11:05

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and School of Oriental and African Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

BULLETIN

OF THE

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

VOL. VIII. PART 4.

Ttaugara

By H. W. BAILEY

STEIN MS. Ch. 00269 is a report by *haḍa* ('envoys'), who call themselves *ṅaśa bīsa* ('humble servants'), on behalf of seven *rispura* ('princes'). It consists of 120 lines, but of that a considerable part cannot yet be translated. The report is concerned with the cities of Ṣacū and Kaṃmicū. Danger from robbers is reported and an investment of the city of Kaṃmicū, so that food and cattle are lacking. Then comes the following passage, which is quoted here for the geographical names (lines 75–80):

75 cu jsām kaṃmicū bādūmna tta vaña drrai pacaḍa ṣṭāre

76 cū ttūḍīśa u ttürkibayarkāva u hättibara u
īci imjūva ¹ tta yīpikīmnittahi: u beḍi **77** darūki
nasta ṣṭāre

ci buri hvaihu:ra ² tta biśi karastahi: nasta
u karastaha

78 cu dūmva u cahi:spata u sūlya ³ tta jsām kītha
khu tta viña drrai pacaḍa biśi ham **79** tsa ni samīmde
kaṃmicū hā hervi ⁴ haḍi ni ttramdi hame
śālai āphāje ⁵ u śālai jsām va **80** khāysi niśti

¹ u *īci imjūva* is written under the line.

² *hvaihu:ra* are probably Uighurs, cf. Tib. *Hor*, *JRAS* 1931, 832, and Chinese

回鶻 *yūai-yuət*.

³ *sūlya* seems elsewhere, in a document from the Khotan region, to mean the people of Kāśyap (Tib. *su-liq*).

⁴ *hervi*, often in this document, 'any'.

⁵ *āphāje* 'investment (?)'. Cf. *phaj-* in *hamphāj-* 'to envelope'; *naṣphaj-* occurs in *cā naṣphajāṃde mami puña avamāta*.

Translation :

As to the *bādūna*¹ in *Kaṃmicū*, three sections now exist. As to *ttūḍīsa* and *ttūrkiḅayarkāva* and the *hāttibara* and *īci* (and) *imjūva*, they are now settled in *yīpikīmīnīttahi*: and *bedīdarūki*. As many as are *hvaihu:ra*, all those are settled in *karastahi*: [and *karastaha*].² As to *dūmva* and *cahi:spata* and *sūlya*, they are now in the city, so that now all the three sections disagree together. No envoy has entered *Kaṃmicū*. On the one side is investment (?), on the other side there is no food.

It is necessary to confront this with a passage of the *Ṣacū* document, published by F. W. Thomas and Sten Konow, *Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang*, 27–31, which contains a list of names, probably at the same time names of places and of peoples. The spacings are significant.

imjuva	yahi:ḍa kari	aḍapahūtti	bākū
bāsikātti	karabīri	kāribari tti	tūlisi ṣṭāre
. . imjū	sī kari	ttaugāra	ayabīri
caraihi:	yabūtti kari	añahi:ḍipabhūtti	
karattaha ³ pata	tti ttari ttrūsahūta.	sāḍimīya ⁴	
ttrūkibayarkāta ⁵	cūṇūḍa.		

The first list is certainly concerned with *Kaṃmicū* near *Ṣacū* (= *Tun-huang*), which is doubtless 甘 州 *kām tsīḡu* (*kan-tṣou*, *kan-chou*) in *Kansu*. The name occurs also in *Stein MS.* (*Brit. Mus.*) 5212, 4 *kamacū kīthāṣṭa* 'to the city of *Kamacū*', and in the *Ṣacū Document 16 kammacū kathi u laicū kaṃtha u śāhvā kaṃtha*.⁶ In

¹ *bādūmna* occurs in two other passages of this document: 64 *tī mīm biṣi bādūmna ārri ttyām pahaisām īḍāṃdi si . . .* 'thus all the *bādūna* attributed (*īḍa*-partic. to *ar-* in *ham-ar-*, *hamīḍa* 'join' and *nāmavarīḍa* 'famous') the fault to those *pahaisa*, saying that . . .' 69 *u khvai bādūmna ttū heri bausta* 'and when the *bādūna* understood that matter'.

² Apparently dittography.

³ *karattaha* perhaps corresponds to *karastaha* of the first list. *pata* could represent Old Iran. *pati-* 'lord', cf. *Khotan Saka spāta*, *spā* 'general' < **spādapati*, corresponding to Tibetan *sde-dpon*. So read (in place of *yāta*, *yā*) *spāta*, *spā* in the *Ṣacū* document 47, 39.

⁴ *sāḍimīya* is struck out. One might think of *Solmi*.

⁵ *ttrūki-*, *ttūrki-* of this name is perhaps 'Turk', *Tib. dru-gu* (F. W. Thomas, *J.R.A.S.* 1931, 816 ff.). In this same document Ch. 00269, line 48, we find *ttūrki uha: hīvi* 'belonging to the chief (?) of the Turks'.

⁶ *laicū* is almost certain. In Ch. 0048, 5, *kaṃmicū* and *ṣacū* are also mentioned in association. In the same context occurs *śvahvā*, where one will no doubt recognize *śāhvā*.

the two lists *tūdīsa* corresponds to *tūlīsi*,¹ *ttürkibayarkāva* to *ttrrūki-bayarkāta* (so to read), *imjūva* to *ijūva*. We shall probably infer that the other places or peoples are in the same neighbourhood. This is important for *ttaugara*, which is thus assured about A.D. 800 in the region of Kanchou.²

This notice of *ttaugara* provides the indigenous confirmation of the oft-quoted passage of Ptolemy, *Geogr.* vi, 16 (see F. W. Thomas, *JRAS* 1931, 834-5, A. Herrmann in Sven Hedin, *Southern Tibet*, viii (1922) 212) who names from the itinerary of Maes Titianus the people *θαγοῦροι*, and the mountain *θαγοῦρον ὄρος* south of the city of *θογάρα*. It is clear that at that time *θογάρα* was an important city on the silk route, and it has therefore been identified with Kanchou. Since *ttaugara* seems not to be *kammicū*, it may represent a small adjacent town or a people in which the name had survived during the six intervening centuries.

In or near this same region lived according to Tibetan documents the *thod-kar*, *phod-kar* (F. W. Thomas, *JRAS* 1931, 834-5, information which has unfortunately been overlooked by recent writers on the Tochari). In the same region from the second century B.C. were remnants of a people called 大月氏 by the Chinese (most recently discussed by Pelliot, *Tokharien et Koutchéen*, *JA* 1934, i, 37, note 1,—cited below as *Tokh.*). The 大月氏 had in the second century B.C. passed to the west, and there also a similar name is found: *τοχαροι*. It is possible, as has often been contended (see the bibliography in Schwentner, *Tocharisch* (1935) 18), that the two names, the native name³ *toyara* and the Chinese 大月氏 refer to the one people. One might indeed have expected to find so important a name as *toyara*, which persisted for centuries, transcribed in Chinese of the second-first centuries B.C.

[If the *toyara* are the 大月氏, 大月支, the conjecture, which has however no importance for the following discussion, may perhaps be allowed, after so many earlier conjectures, that the Chinese name

¹ For *s* and *ś*, *ḍ* and *l*, cf. *śiḍathasi*, *śilathasa* 'Šiltās, Chilās' in Ch. I, 0021a, b 15-16, edited in *Acta Orientalia* (in the press). They are probably a section of the 鐵勒 *t'iet-lək *tōlis*.

² Clauson's very doubtful discussion of this passage setting *ttaugara* in Tokhāristān need not be considered here (*JRAS* 1931, 309).

³ The occurrence of the one name—of *θογάρα ttaugara thod-kar* in the east and of *τοχαροι* in the west—used of the one people, suffices to prove that this people had brought the name with them, since the name is found in places too remote for it to be possible to suppose the name to be a foreign designation. It is therefore evidently their native name.

大月氏 in its first two syllables is an attempt to approximate to the foreign name *toγara*—it is even possible that one ought to presuppose an earlier form **θodyara*—at a time, long before Hiuan Tsang's efforts in the cause of syllabic transcription, when a different, disyllabic, system seems to have been preferred. It would of course also be possible to suppose that a familiar name had been partially adapted to designate newly-encountered foreigners. In A.D. 600 大 was *d'ái* or *t'ái* and 月 was *ngi^wwt*, earlier *d'ád* (*-d* being inferred from the later *-i*; *-θ* has also been conjectured), and *ngi^wwt* (Karlgren in a letter of date 23.1.1936, and cf. Konow, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* II, i, lx, and 'Notes on the Indo-Scythian Chronology', *Journ. Ind. Hist.* xii, 6; Pelliot, *Tokh.* 25): *d'ád-ngi^wwt* could perhaps render **toγar-* (or **θo(d)γar-*). On this theory 氏 or 支 would be explained either as a foreign word of unknown meaning, possibly a title, since we may think of 塞王 *sək-jí^wang*, Skt. *śakamurūṇḍa*, if 王 is here correct, or of 骨咄施 *kuət-tuət-siē* beside 骨咄 *kuət-tuət* for the name of Khottal (Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, 276); or 氏 would be a Chinese word in the sense of 'clan', the alternative pronunciation of 氏 (*tšiē* beside *ziē*) in this name being then perhaps due to dialectal pronunciation in Chinese and hence replaceable by 支 *tšiē* (which does itself occur in the sense of 'branch of a family'). Such a use of 'clan' could be paralleled in other Central Asian documents, Tibetan or Saka, and seems to be known in early Chinese. On the same theory the use of 月氏 without 大, which is found in the earliest reference in the account of the Shī-ki, c. 100 B.C., where however we find also 大月氏 beside 小月氏, would be due to the two reasons that the Chinese tended to abbreviate foreign words (and not only proper names, as is attested by 比丘尼 *pji* (*b'ji*)- *k'izu-nji* beside 尼 *nji*, Skt. *bhikṣuṇī*; 阿梨耶 *á-lji-ia* beside *lji-ia*, Skt. *ārya*; 伽藍 *g'ia-lám* Skt. *saṅghārāma*), and that they could have taken 大 ('great') as their own word for 'great'. This second reason would also explain the purely Chinese invention of the term 小月氏 'the little 月氏' where 小 *sǎu* 'little' stands in contrast to 大 'great'. The name occurs also, abbreviated to 支, before personal names (Pelliot, *Tokh.* 40 note 1). 大 is also used in the name 大宛 *t'ái-í^wwn* beside 宛 alone (*JAOS* 37, 148), and in, 大食 *t'ái-dz'iak*, Mid. Pers. *tāzīy* 'Arab'.

A curious piece of evidence deserves to be cited here. According to the Memoirs on the Western Lands 西域記, on his return journey

Hiuan Tsang passed the ruins of Endere (Sāca of the Kharoṣṭhī documents, identified by Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, i, 429, cf. Herrmann in *Southern Tibet*, viii, 211), between Niya and Krorayina. Here, apparently through the hearing of some tales, he thought to recognize the ruins of the old 都邏 (with variants: read *tuoχuá lá*¹) country. Though the identification may be incorrect, it is evident that Hiuan Tsang was here using his ordinary transcription of the name of the western *toχara* to refer to the *toγara* of the east. It may be that he was purposely replacing the old (now inadequate) transcription 大月(氏) by his more exact trisyllabic transcription *tuoχuá lá*.

It is also interesting to recall that two wooden tablets from Niya mention a man of the 月支國 'the *ngi^{wot}-tšie* country', see most recently Pelliot, *Tokh.* 40, note 1.]

TŌYARISTĀN, TOΧĀRISTĀN

1. *The Name*

The detailed discussions of the land of Tokhāristān have now made it clear that for the period of the fourth to eighth centuries A.D. only one region (apart from the reminiscence of the eastern *toγara* near Kanchou surviving, as we have seen above, in Greek, Khotan Saka, Tibetan and probably Chinese) was recognized to have the name *toγara*. This was the country between Sogdiana (Sughd) at the Iron Gates (*dar ī āhanīn*) and Bāmiyān (see Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 199 ff., Pelliot, *Tokh.* 33 ff.). The capital was Balkh (*Bag-la* in Tibetan) and the city of Tarmita was comprised in it. It was therefore the old Bactria. The evidence is furnished by Arabic, Armenian, Tibetan and Chinese sources. It is now not disputed.

There remain however certain points to be cleared up² in connection with the name itself. The Chinese transcriptions are given by Pelliot, *Tokh.* 34 ff. and 48 note 1 (cf. Herrmann, *Southern Tibet*, viii, p. 450) as follows:

(1) Travellers and Histories

都貨羅	<i>tuoχuá lá</i>	吐呼羅	<i>t'uoχuá lá</i>
覩貨邏	<i>tuoχuá lá</i>	吐火羅	<i>t'uoχuá lá</i>
覩火羅	<i>tuoχuá lá</i>	吐豁羅	<i>t'uoχuá lá</i>

¹ Taisho ed. 2087, p. 945, col. 3.

² It is necessary to treat the problem in somewhat elementary fashion, since Indianists, who have largely interested themselves in this matter, seem rarely to have understood the method of writing in consonantal scripts.

(2) Religious books translated from Sanskrit

兜 佉 勒 *t̥u k'i^{wo} lək*兜 佉 羅 *t̥u k'i^{wo} lā*兜 沙 羅 *t̥u ṣa lā*

The name is recorded apart from the Chinese in scripts of two kinds : (1) using vowels, (2) without vowels. Only the vocalized scripts can be used to recover the full word.

(a) (1) Greek *τοχαροι ταχοροι*, in the east *θαγουροι θογαρα*.

(2) Latin (derived from Greek) *tochari* with MS. variants including *thogari*.

The word occurs in verse scanned *τοχᾶροι*, but unfortunately the verse is late and cannot be pressed to decide the quantity of *-a-* (see Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, p. 207, note 4). The second form *ταχοροι*, if correct, confirms the scansion with short second syllable.

(3) Armenian *t'uχari-k'*, *toχarastan*.

(4) Sanskrit *tukhāra*, *tuṣāra* (in some districts *ṣ* was pronounced *kh*), *tukhāra*, *tuṣkāra*.

(5) Tibetan in the east *thod-kar*, *phod-kar*; in the west *tho-gar*, *tho-dkar*, *tho-kar*.

(6) Khotan Saka *ttaugara*.

(b) (without vowels) (1) Turkish *twχry* (*twryry*, *twqry*) in Manichean and Buddhist texts.

(2) Mid. Pers. *twryrst*[*n*].

(3) Arabic-Pers. طخارستان *tuχāristān*, طخارا *tuχārā*, also طخارستان *taχāristān* and طخیرستان *taχairistān* (*u* may represent *u* or *o*), see Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 228 f.

(4) Syriac *tḥwrstn*.

The *ā* of Sanskrit has been supposed to be due to analogy with *tuṣāra* 'cold'. The Arabic alif (*-ā-*) and *ai* (implying *ā*) favour a long vowel, but are not decisive, since quality may have guided them in their spelling. Of the vocalized scripts only Saka is unambiguous with *-ā-*, but most probably Greek also has *ā*. Tibetan does not normally distinguish quantity, and Armenian is unable to do so. It is of course possible that the *toyara* language was indifferent to quantity of vowels, but *ā* is indicated by the city name (Sogd.) *δρωϊν* (**θruwān* or **δruwān*, Gr. *θροαυα*).¹

¹ We have however *krwr̄n* beside *kwrynk* in Sogdian for *krorayina*. Pelliot's transcription **darwān*, *Tokh.* 31, is naturally not acceptable.

The medial consonant is either γ or χ (the labial u of the Chinese forms with $\chi u\acute{a}$ is not elsewhere attested; on Syriac *thurstn*, see below). Saka $-g-$, pronounced $-\gamma-$, and Mid. Pers. γ in a script which has distinct signs for g γ χ , possibly Latin *thogarii* and the eastern forms in Greek show γ , elsewhere in Greek, Arabic and Armenian occurs χ (to which Sanskrit *kh*, *ḥkh* correspond). Tibetan (*g*, *k*, *dk*) is ambiguous. Since 貨 $\chi u\acute{a}$ was used to express the $\gamma\bar{a}$ of فرغانه *faryāna* (Chavannes and Pelliot, *Traité Manichéen retrouvé en Chine* (1913), 208 note), the Chinese also must be considered ambiguous here.

There remains the Turkish *twryy* (*twχry*), which must be a little more fully treated. It is necessary to protest against the mechanical reading *toχrī*, which since F. W. K. Müller¹ has had so much currency. The matter stands as follows. In the Sogdian script which was adopted and adapted by the Uighur Turks (a description is given by Von le Coq, 'Kurze Einführung in die uigurischen Schriftkunde,' *Mitteil. d. Seminars für orientalischen Sprachen*, Berlin, 1919, 93–109), vowels are not clearly indicated. In Sogdian itself *a*, *i*, *u* are often left unmarked, but they may be expressed by the use of \prime (alif), *y*, and *w*. Since \prime , *y*, and *w* may also indicate \bar{a} , \bar{i} \bar{e} , and \bar{o} \bar{u} respectively, only etymology can decide when \prime is *a* or \bar{a} , *y* is *i* or \bar{i} or \bar{e} , *w* is *u* or \bar{u} or \bar{o} . We also find $\prime\prime$, $\prime y$, and $\prime w$ in use. In Sogdian script only consonants exist. The Turks took and imperfectly adapted this consonantal alphabet to their vocalic system. Beside the system which left *a*, *i*, *u* unmarked (there are many Turkish words in which at least one syllable is written without the vowel sign, as in *pyltymz*, *biltimiz* 'we knew'), it became the custom to use $\prime\prime$ initially for *a*, \prime initially for \bar{a} (but also, more rarely, *a*), medially for *a* or \bar{a} , *y* for *i* and \bar{i} (*e* not being distinguished), *w* for *u* or *o*, *wy* in the first syllable (but sometimes only *w*) for \bar{u} or \bar{o} . So we find in Turkish words *tngr̄y t̄ngri*, *ym̄ yim̄ā*, *kntw̄ k̄ant̄ü*, *yr̄ly yar̄l̄ȳ*. In foreign words this vowelless system is equally common, particularly for the reason that in many words the Sogdian spellings were received with the script itself. So we have *smn̄n̄č* (Sogd. *šmn̄n̄č*) **šamananč* 'female disciple', *ps̄k* (Sogd. $\prime ps̄k$, Mid. Pers. *pusg*, Av. *pusā*) **pusak* 'crown', *šrbk*, *gr̄b̄k*, Skt.

¹ Transcriptions of F. W. K. Müller must be used for linguistic purposes with some caution. He was evidently satisfied to get a set of graphic correspondences even if he did violence to the phonetic system of the languages. In Iranian his first attempts to render Persian, Parthian and Sogdian were perhaps excusable at the time, but they did not give Iranian forms. For Turkish—a simpler phonetic system—his method had less evil effects. But the same mechanical results gave for example *bal̄iy* in place of *bal̄iq*, if the two dots distinguishing *q* from γ were absent.

śrāvaka, *prty'pwd*, *prtyk'pwt* Skt. *pratyekabuddha*, *pwtystb*, *pwtystb* Skt. *bodhisattva*, *tby'č*, *tby'č tarvač* 'China', *bχ'r*, *brχ'r* (Sogd. *βrχ'r*) Skt. *vihāra*, *brχm'dty* Skt. *brahmadatta*.

Applied to *twγry* (*twχry twqry*), this means that a great number of readings is possible. To decide between these readings external evidence is necessary. This evidence is afforded by the spelling in vocalized scripts. It proves that three syllables must be read.¹ Between *u* and *o* in the first syllable it is not possible to decide positively. The medial consonant can be read *γ χ* (or possibly *q*). The eastern forms have *γ* in Greek and Saka, and Mid. Pers. *tōγaristān* (so to vocalize) makes *γ* possible for Turkish also. Hence either *toγarī* or *toχarī* (hardly *toqarī*) may be read. A reading *toχrī* is purely mechanical and useless to decide the indigenous pronunciation of the name.

The Syriac *tḥwrstn* also needs a note² of explanation. It is probable that the position of the *w* is due to a tendency similar to that observable in Sogdian particularly in the later texts to traject the *w*. In Sogdian *δwχt-*, *δγwt-* is *duχt* or *duγd*, Mid. Pers. *duχt* 'daughter'; *rχwšn* is *rōχšn*, Mid. Pers. *rōšn* 'light'; *swγdykt swγdik-t* 'Sogdians' beside *swγdyk* adj. 'Sogdian', *swγdyrn'k swγdiyānak* 'Sogdian', and so in other words. We shall probably read Syriac *tḥwrstn* as *tōχarastān* or *tōχārastān*, or with *ū* in place of *ō*.

2. Script

Hiuan Tsang in the Memoirs of the Western Lands 西域記 showed himself particularly interested in the writing and literature of the countries he visited. He was it seems perfectly familiar with the Indian Brāhmī writing, and in Agni,³ Kuci, Khāṣa (Kāšyar), and Khotana he remarks that they used the Indian writing with some modifications. His accuracy in this has been attested by the discoveries of MSS. in Central Asia. But he came upon other scripts which evidently seemed to him to need further description. Happily he thought to describe the scripts of Sogdiana and Tokhāristān in detail.

¹ The *-y* of the Turkish form has probably not the same origin as the *-i* in Armenian *t'uχari-k'*. It seems to be due in both cases to some Iranian form. In Turkish it may be the *-i* of the nom. sing. Sogdian, as in *yymky* Sogd. *ymgyy*, *ymqyy* BSOS. viii, 588, but in Armenian this would not be possible: it would there be rather an adjectival *-i* < *-ik*. The Turkish form is the same in both Buddhist and Manichean texts. Markwart, *Festgabe Szinnyei* (1927) 67, read *toχary*.

² Pelliot's interpretation of the Syriac form, *Tokh.* 48, note 1, ad calc., is unacceptable.

³ So the Wei annals, translated by S. Lévi, *Le "Tokharien,"* p. 11, state: *l'écriture est comme celle des Brahmanes.*

The close correspondence of the two descriptions can be seen when they are set side by side. We are fortunate in having recent translations by Pelliot, *Tokh.* 48 ff.

Sogdiana

字源簡略。
本二十餘言。
轉而相生。
其流浸廣。
粗有書記。
豎讀其文。

Tokhāristān

字源二十五言。
轉而相生。
用之備物。
書以橫讀。
自左向右。
文記漸多。
逾廣率利。

Taisho edition 2087, p. 871, col. 1, ll. 12–13, Beal, transl. p. 26.

Translation by Pelliot.

Les lettres de l'écriture sont peu nombreuses, constituées par vingt et quelques éléments primitifs, qui se combinent et s'engendrent et produisent un large développement (de vocabulaire). [Ces gens] ont quelques œuvres écrites dont ils lisent le texte verticalement.¹

Taisho edition 2087, p. 872, col. 1, ll. 17–18, Beal, transl. p. 38.

Les lettres de l'écriture sont au nombre de 25, qui se combinent et s'engendrent, et par leur emploi s'étendent à toutes choses. L'écriture se lit horizontalement, en allant de gauche à droite. Les œuvres littéraires ont progressivement crû en nombre, et dépassent en ampleur celles du *sou-li* (sogdien).

The statements are admirably clear. Hiuan Tsang is in both cases describing an alphabetic system of few letters. It is evident too that he did not recognize the Indian Brāhmī script in either of these. The Sogdian is known to us beyond dispute. Hiuan Tsang's description is accurate. Happily the coins attributed to the Hephthalites (Junker, 'Die hephthalitischen Münzinschriften,' *SBAW* 1930) and the Kushano-Sasanian coins (Herzfeld, *Memoirs of the Indian Archæological Survey*, 1930, No. 38), beside their Brāhmī and Aramaic legends, show us this script of Tokhāristān: it is the Greek script of Bactria. The Greek alphabet had twenty-four letters, but on the coins a new letter β is known representing ś. Hiuan Tsang seems here also to be exact. So evident indeed is this conclusion that it is regrettable that Pelliot,

¹ In the description of Sogdiana, the T'ang Annals (cap. 221, 下, p. 1, col. 8) state: 習旁行書, which Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, 134, rendered: (*Ces gens*) sont habitués à écrire en lignes horizontales.

Tokh. 53, should have made an attempt to find the Brāhmī writing¹ in this description, without reference to the existence of the Greek writing on the coins.

There is however one very important additional fact to notice, although it has not so far been mentioned in connection with the Tocharian problem. In the Berlin Academy are preserved (at least three) fragments in the same script as that of the Hephthalite coins, that is, in Greek script. These fragments,² which Junker is at present studying (loc. cit., p. 3), were brought from Central Asia. The writing of Tokhāristān was therefore known in the Turfan region.

It is therefore impossible to escape the conclusion that the Turk^ʿsh *toyarī* (*toḡarī*) applies to this, the only attested, literature of Tokhāristān, and written in the Greek script.

3. Language

Hiuan Tsang (the passages are conveniently brought together by Pelliot, *Tokh.* 49 f.; used earlier by Staël-Holstein, *Izv. Akad. Nauk* 1909, 479 ff.) states that the language of Bāmiyān was a little different from that of Tokhāristān. In Šīynān, although the writing was like that of Tokhāristān, there were differences in the language. In Kāpīšī the language and doctrinal rules were very different and in Šyāmāka (*šjang mjię*) also the language was different. This would suit the theory

¹ The Brāhmī script distinguishes 48 sounds for classical Sanskrit, and in Dialect A there are 10 (if *ta* was originally distinct from *ḍha* there are 11) additional signs. Documents in Dialect A contain Sanskrit words, and in foreign names also such sounds as *h* and *kh* are represented. Still other Brāhmī signs are used to write Barčuq (Maralbashi) Saka and Turkish.

² The first notice of these fragments was given by Von le Coq, 'Köktürkisches aus Turfan,' *SBAW* 1909, 1049 '... mehrere grössere Fragmente einer Buchrolle in einer bis heute noch unbekanntem semitischen kursivschrift. . . .' F. W. K. Müller added a postscript, p. 1061: 'Die „bis heute noch unbekanntem semitische kursivschrift“ ist, wie ich inzwischen feststellen konnte, die Schrift der Hephthaliten (هياطلة), richtig wohl هياطلة)* oder „weissen Hunnen“.'

The Hephthalites had occupied Tokhāristān about A.D. 468. Presumably they adopted the Tocharian writing, since according to 宋雲 *suong jiyən*, they had no writing of their own (Chavannes, *BEFEO*. 1903, 404: *dans ce pays, on ne connaît pas d'écriture*). The script of these Central Asian fragments was in any case not confined to the Hephthalites. Hiuan Tsang records it also in Šīynān and 商彌 *šjang mjię*, Šyāmāka, which (cf. Herrmann in *Southern Tibet*, viii, 447) was Mastūj and Citrāl. It was therefore premature to call these fragments Hephthalite.

* One must of course in this problem keep in mind the possibility of a phonetic change of *šf*, *ēβ* to *ē* which would suit the NPers. form *haitāl*.

that the language of Tokhāristān was Iranian.¹ It is therefore to be noted that the Hephthalite coins use an Iranian titulary ΒΑΓΟ 'god', ΟΖΟΡΟΒΑΔΙ 'hazārapati (leader of a thousand, but long established as an important rank in Persia)', and employ the Iranian gen. plur. -āno (Junker, loc. cit.).² The significant presence of γ or χ in the name *toyara-toxara* would be compatible with an Iranian origin. In the east similarly the city name θροαα Sogd. δρωη δρωηη shows a fricative (the θ of θροαα and the Sogd. δ together exclude *t* or *t'*: in Chinese the name is 敦煌 *tuən γ'áng* and 屯皇 *d'uen γ'áng* with *t* and *d'*).

The possibility however that the Tochari in their wanderings had changed their language must not be overlooked.³ The 大月氏 who remained in the east (spoken of as the 小月氏) spoke a language like that of the K'iang near whom they lived (see Pelliot, *Tokh.* 37, note 1). Strabo (first century B.C.) writing a hundred years after the Tocharian invasion, knew that the Bactrians and Sogdians spoke similar languages (ed. Meineke xv, 2, 8): ἐπεκτείνεται δὲ τοῦνομα τῆς Ἀριανῆς μέχρι μέρους τινὸς καὶ Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων καὶ ἔτι τῶν πρὸς ἀρκτὸν Βακτριῶν καὶ Σογδιανῶν· εἰσὶ γὰρ πῶς καὶ ὁμόγλωττοι παρὰ μικρόν. Bactra was the Tocharian capital. It remained one of the capitals of the Hephthalites,⁴ although their winter residence was, it seems, elsewhere, in old Badaḫšān (Herrmann, *Asia Major*, ii, 576).

4. Literature

Direct evidence for the existence of this lost *toyara* literature is contained in Turkish colophons from Central Asia. In colophons of the

¹ Muslim authors, Ibn al-Muqaffa' and Muqaddasī, quoted by Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 88–9, indicate that a dialect of *fārsī* 'Persian' was used in Balkh from the eighth century; probably, as Marquart thought, the language of Sasanian Persia had penetrated the city.

² These forms are not Persian, but similar to Sogdian and Khotan Saka.

³ If it could be proved that the first vowel of *toyara* was an *ō* etymologically distinct from *ā* and *ū*, Iranian would be excluded. But evidence is lacking. Tibetan *o*, Greek *o*, Saka *au*, Armenian *o* (in *toḫarastan*) support *o*. Armenian *t'uḫari-k'* could be due to an Iranian pronunciation where *ū* and *ō* were not distinguished. But it would still be necessary, even if the first syllable were *ō*, to prove the existence of *ū* also in the language.

⁴ In the sixth century A.D. according to the Chou annals (composed A.D. 630) based on a report of 慧生 *γi^{uei} s'ung* who travelled in 518–522, the Hephthalites were related to the 大月支. It seems to refer to the time of the report, not to the time of the origin of the 滑 *γ^{ue}at* (Hephthalites) in Dzungaria (see Herrmann, *Asia Major*, ii, 569). Cf. the T'ang annals, Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-Kiue occidentaux*, p. 158.

Turkish version of the Maitreya-samiti, which are conveniently exhibited by F. W. K. Müller and E. Sieg, *Maitrisimit und „Tocharisch“*, *SBAW* 1916, 414, Āryacandra (𑖦𑖅𑖦𑖅𑖦𑖅𑖦𑖅) a native of Nagaradeśa (*nkrydyš*, probably Jalālābād on the Kābul river) is named as the composer (*yaratmiš*).

vaibazaki aryačindri¹ bodis(a)vt k(a)ši ačari

änätkäk² tilintin toγ(a)ri tilinčä yaratmiš

. . pr(a)tnnyarakš(i)t³ ačari toγ(a)ri tilintin türk tilinčä
aqtarmiš

maitri-simit nom bitikdä “maitri bodis(a)vt tuzit t(ä)ngri
yirintin yirtinčökä inmäk” atl(i)γ onunč
ülüş nom tükädi.

Ended is the tenth chapter called “Descent of the Bodhisattva Maitreya from the divine land Tuṣita to the World”, in the book Maitreya-samiti. Composed by Āryacandra Bodhisattva, the Vaibhāṣika, the teacher and ācārya, in the Tocharian language⁴ out of the Indian language. Translated by the Ācārya Prajñārakṣita from the Tocharian language into Turkish.

The meaning of *yarat-* ‘make, create, compose’ is happily certain. It may be illustrated by the sentence *yirig t(ä)ngriγ kim yaratmiš tipän biltim(i)z* ‘we knew who created earth and heaven’ (*Khuastuanift* 167–8, *JRAS* 1911, 291). *yarat-* occurs in hendiadys with *it-* ‘to make’, as in *Säkiz Yükmäk* (*SBAW* 1934) 80 *känt uluš äw barq itgäli yaratγali* ‘die Gründung einer Stadt und eines Dorfes oder eines Hauses und

¹ 𑖦𑖅𑖦𑖅𑖦𑖅𑖦𑖅 with Sogdian spelling of *nt* for *nd* (cf. Sogd. **sknt-* Av. *skēnda-*).

² In view of the statement of Schwentner, *Tocharisch* 12, note 1, that the Turkish *änätkäk* “ist noch unerklärt”, it should be pointed out that the Turkish *ntk:k*, *ntk:k*, *ntk:*, is quite simply explained by reference to the Sogdian *yntk:w* ‘Indian’ (Reichelt, *Die soghd. Handschriftenreste d. Brit. Mus.*, ii, 70, l. 37). In Sogdian words *-k -w -y* interchange according to the obsolescent system of nominal inflexion (cf. *Gram. sogd.* ii, 75). A form **yntk:k* is nom. to the acc. *yntk:w*. It should be vocalized **indukak*, a derivative of *induk* from *hindu-* (Sogdian does not preserve Old Iranian *h-*), Mid.Pers. *hindūy*, Armen. *hnduk*. This *induk* is attested in the plural *yntkwot induk-t* (with trajected *w*, rather than with Reichelt “nom. sg. koll. (?)”). Turkish has modified and rearranged the vowels, a method of adaptation attested in other foreign words, e.g. *prdn* Skt. *pradhāna*, *symt* Skt. *samiti*. Pelliot, *T'oung-Pao*, 1931, 459 (quoted by A. von Gabain, *SBAW* 1935, 169) had not fully understood the Sogdian forms. The Chinese 印特伽 *iēn -d'ak-g'ia* (*Life of Hiuan Tsang*, Taisho ed. 2053, p. 227, col. 2, l. 24) approximates to the Sogdian form, since it implies a reading **induka-*.

³ Sogd. *prtnyh*, *prtny*, *prttny* (Müller-Lenz, *Soghdische Texte*, ii, 90–91, Reichelt loc. cit., i, *Dhuta*, 99, 100, 162, 195) transcribes Skt. *prajñā*. It has hence passed to Turkish. The Sogdian indicates a Central Asian pronunciation *dn̄i* for Skt. *jñ*.

⁴ For the use of *-čä* ‘in’ (beside ‘into’), cf. *änätkäk tilinčä* ‘in the Indian language’ in the title of the Sūtra quoted by F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica* ii, 51 note 1.

Hofes'. Cf. also *Säkiz Yükmäk* 243, *ärdinin yaratmış ordular* 'palaces constructed with jewels'. The meaning 'compose' for *yarat-* was used by F. W. K. Müller, apart from this passage, as in *Toçri und Kuisan*, 581: *änätkäk iltäki vaibaš sastar yaradaçi* 'der im Lande Indiens Vaibhāṣa-sāstras verfasst habenden (Lehrer)'. Further examples are to be found in the Manichean texts published by Von le Coq. On the other hand 'translate' is expressed by *äwir-* and *aqtar-*.

The phrase *änätkäk tilintin toç(a)ri tilinčä yaratmış* is not immediately clear,¹ as the perplexities of translators testify (see Pelliot, *Tokh.* 54, and note 1). Two interpretations seem possible: (1) the writer of the colophon wished to express two facts, (a) Āryacandra composed the Maitreya-samiti in Sanskrit and (b) Āryacandra, composer of this Sanskrit poem, composed also a similar poem in *toçari*—he was then both composer and adapter of his own work, and the colophon has only succeeded in expressing clearly his character as composer, which was naturally the most important fact,—or (2) the reference to the 'Indian language' may mean that Āryacandra had used an Indian (Sanskrit or Prakrit) text as his source, such a text as we have embodied in the Khotan Saka text (edited by Leumann, *Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus*, chapter 23) or in Pali and the Divyāvādāna as well as in Chinese sūtras, and out of this had made his *toçari* poem. The second alternative is simpler.

Nagara, Nagarahāra, Nagaradeśa, in the time of Hiuan Tsang was subordinate to Kāpiśi. Unfortunately Hiuan Tsang did not record anything of the language. A native of Nagaradeśa however would clearly have been using a foreign language in writing Sanskrit. It is possible too that *toçari* was also a foreign language for him. We are not however told where the Maitreya-samiti was composed. He may have been resident in Balkh or Tarmita at the time.

5. Translations

The activity of translators in Central Asia is abundantly attested by colophons. We hear of translations from *Toçari*, Tibetan (*twypwt*) and Chinese (*tbyč tbyč*) into Turkish; from Kuchean into *Toçari* and the Barčuq language (probably the language called *Kanġākī* in Arabic), a fact in no way surprising in view of the well-attested activity of the kingdom of Kuci in the propagation of Buddhism; also of the translation of Indian books into Khotan Saka (from *hūdvaṃga*), Sogdian (from *yntkw*), Tibetan, Chinese and Kuchean; and trans-

¹ Schwentner's 'deutlich', *Tocharisch* 12, is too optimistic.

lation of Khotanese (the language of Li-yul, perhaps Saka) into Tibetan. Elsewhere there is mention of the translation of Chinese into Sanskrit (Chavannes *BEFEO* 1903, 438).

It has been necessary to clear the ground by establishing the meaning of *toyara*; and to reject the erroneous view of the script and literature of Tokhāristān, before proceeding to the complex problem of the language known from the fragments published in *Tocharische Sprachreste* by Sieg and Siegling, 1921, and treated in their grammar with Schulze's collaboration: *Tocharische Grammatik*, 1931. The language may at first be conveniently referred to by the neutral name (which has been used above in the footnotes) Dialect A.

DIALECT A

The Maitreya-samiti of Āryacandra, undoubtedly the same poem as is preserved in Turkish, is known in Dialect A. Fragmentary colophons are preserved in Nos. 253a 5, 258b 3, 259b 2, 263a 6, 265a 1, 287b 3, 297a 8, 298b 4, 299a 7, 302b 6 (see Müller and Sieg, *Maitrisimit und „Tocharisch“*, *SBAW* 1916, 415). The various colophons allow the following to be established:

vaibhāṣikyāp āryacandres raritwunt¹ maitreyasamitināṭkaṃ
in the Maitreya-samiti-nāṭaka composed by Āryacandra the
Vaibhāṣika.

Whether the Turkish has abbreviated the title to *Maitreya-samiti* or the version in Dialect A has expanded the title by the addition of *nāṭaka* cannot be decided. The difference may reflect different manuscript sources.

No reference is made to translation.² But if the Turkish colophon quoted above is correct a Tocharian version existed and possibly, as noted earlier, also a Sanskrit original.

In the infancy of Central Asian studies, in 1908, Sieg and Siegling, both Indianists, published a paper treating of Dialect A and Kuchean,³

¹ The meaning of the verb *ritw-*, nominal derivative *retwe*, in Kuchean *ritt-* and *raitwe*, is among those best attested. It translates in both dialects Skt. *yog-*, *yuj-* 'to join, compose'. The Turkish *yaratmış* 'make, create' in the same context confirms this meaning. It is impossible to justify the use of 'übersetzen' either for the verb *ritw-* or the noun *retwe*.

² It is equally the practice of colophons in Khotan Saka to omit reference to translation from Sanskrit, although such information may be given at the beginning or in the body of the work.

³ "Kuchean" for Dialect B is now beyond dispute. Turkish *kws'n* (in Sogdian script) and *kws'n* (in Arabic script) is the name of Kuci (*Kuchā*). *kūsān tili* 'language of Kuci' is conclusive. It should be remembered that *kuci* is the name of a country (Hiuan Tsang used 屈支國 'land of Kuci'), not only of a city as Müller and Sieg

entitled ' *Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen* '. From the existence of the two versions¹ of the Maitreya-samiti, and the reference in the Turkish colophon, the invalid inference was drawn that Dialect A and *toçari* were the same language. It is of course clear that a version in the language of Tokhāristān (that is, in Greek script, as we have seen) does not exclude the possibility of other versions.² At that time however knowledge of Central Asia was vague. It was quickly discovered that the second assumption—that it was the language of the Indo-Scythians—was wrong. The next step was to propose to exclude Dialect B (Kuclean) from the name " *Tocharisch* ", although it is clear that if the Tochari had spoken Dialect A, Kuclean is too closely related to be anything but a language of the Tochari. When it became certain that *toçari* meant the language of Tokhāristān, an attempt was made to save the first assumption by the further unsupported assumption that Dialect A had been imported for study from Bactria. But there, as is now certain, the Greek script was used for literature. Dialect A is known only in the Brāhmī script. We have seen above that the script of Tokhāristān was known in the Turfan region, as the Berlin fragments attest. It is clear that a better case for the identification of the language of these fragments in Greek script with the *ioçari* of the Turkish colophon could be made out, though it is well to remember that they too may contain a still unknown language.³ There is nothing beyond the existence of versions of the Maitreya-samiti in *toçari* (according to the Turkish colophon) and in Dialect A to justify the inference of their identity. The loan-words in Turkish which were quoted to support this inference may be from either Kuclean⁴ or Dialect A. As will be seen below Turkish seem to have imagined, see Schwentner, *Tocharisch*, 13–14. Sanskrit has *kaucya* ' Kuclean ' for the people of the land of Kuci (Lüders, *Weitere Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie von Ostturkestan*, *SBAW* 1930, 17). [It is very necessary for Central Asian studies that all Kuclean materials should now soon be made available.]

¹ The same argument would prove that Tibetan, Chinese and Khotan Saka were identical, because the Sumukha-dhāraṇī is known in all three versions.

² It is well to remember that the author Āryacandra was from Nagaradeśa, to the south of Tokhāristān.

³ We have to remember that in 1933 near Samarkand a document in unknown script was found. It is stated to be written from right to left, the letters not being joined, see *Sogdiiskii Sbornik*, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, 1934, p. 37, No. 15. We have also the long list of names in the colophon of the Gilgit Sanskrit MS. (see S. Lévi, *JA* 1932, 1, 45 ff.), such as *khukhuthūla*, *khukhuphāna*, *utrūphana*, *lerapukhra*, *lerakṣiṇa*. These are evidently not Turkish which does not know initial *l-* (or *r-*).

⁴ A fact recognized also by Müller and Sieg, loc. cit., *SBAW* 1916, 410 note 2, who state that *kāṣṣi*, *wasampāt*, *piṃtwāt*, *kaṣār*, *len paryān* and *rājagri* are known also in Kuclean.

has other such loanwords where only the corresponding Kucheans words, but not those of Dialect A are attested. The evidence against the identification is positive, and the list of improbabilities involved in the theory that Dialect A known only in Brāhmī script was imported from Tokhāristān is long (the period of 600–700 years' separation of Kucheans and Dialect A in Bactria, the different script, the significant absence of MSS. in Dialect A in Kuci to which they were supposed to be imported, the long period of the independent kingdoms of Kuci and Agni which makes an identical language in both almost unthinkable, the silence of the Chinese as to *toṃari* books for study in Kuci or Agni, where they stated that Indian books were studied, the close relationship of the two dialects, even in loanwords, the use of different Buddhist technical terminology if the Kucheans had learnt from Dialect A, the absence of positive information how a language like Dialect A in Bactria became the language of Kuci). They are in fact insuperable.

AGNI

In referring to the kingdom of Agni¹ it is this same name Agni which foreigners employed. It occurs in the Saka text from Murtoq near Turfan, which is in the same dialect as the texts from Barčuq (Maralbashi), edited by Sten Konow, *Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt*, SBAW 1935, No. viii, in the form *agñye* gen. sing. It is known also in Chinese in various transcriptions, brought together by Lüders, *Weitere Beiträge* 24 ff., as follows :

烏夷 'uo-i	焉着 ään-g'ji, jän-g'ji
烏着 'uo-g'ji	
億尼 iäk-nji	阿着尼 á-g'ji-nji

One might deduce from these a native name **okñi* with *k* not *g*, since *g* is considered to be foreign to the language of Agni, and *o* not *a* or *u*,² if the Chinese 'uo and á, Skt. and Saka *a* are imperfect attempts to represent the one native sound.

The Sanskrit text dealing with the domestic affairs of Agni, given in full below, uses Agni for the country, and a painting illustrated on

¹ The history of Agni (later called by the half-Turkish half-Persian name Qarašahr) is given, somewhat too briefly, by S. Lévi, *Le "Tokharien"*, JA 1933, 1, 8 ff. It is interesting to recall that 龍會 *li^wong yu^{ai}*, who died before A.D. 345, seems to have been a sovereign with power extending to Krorayina (see Chavannes in Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, 537, 543, F. W. Thomas, *Acta Orient.* 1934, 49). People of Agni were also dispersed in Kansu and the Qomul region (Pelliot, *T'oung Pao*, 1931, 496, and Giles, *BSOS* vi, 844: 'the Lung (Dragon) tribe').

² 烏 'uo is used to transcribe Skt. *u* in *udyāna* 烏狀那 'uo -dz'iang-ná.

the title-page of *Tocharische Sprachreste* has an inscription which reads: *śiṣya guru ācārya śīlacandra a[g]neya* (ibid., introd., xii). *Agneya* is 'Agnean, of the land of Agni'. The Turkish form of the name has not yet been pointed out. It is therefore to be hoped that it will occur in the Uighur version of the Life of Hiuan Tsang, of which the fifth chapter has been recently edited by A. von Gabain, *Die uigurischen Übersetzung der Biographie Hüan Tsang*, SBAW 1935.¹

[A conjecture for a possible native etymology of Agni should not be forgotten here. If **okñi* is adopted as the indigenous name attested by Chinese, Saka and Sanskrit (in Sanskrit *gñ* is not used, hence *gn* would be substituted for it), such a word **okñi* would be an adj. derivative in *-ñi* to **ok*, as in *yokañi* 'thirsty', cf. *yoke* 'thirst' in Dialect A. In turn **ok* would be the form of Dialect A corresponding to Kuchean *auk* 'serpent'. It is possible that this word could express both 'serpent' and 'dragon' ('dragon' legends are recorded for Kuci), but for the twelve-year animal cycle two terms were needed, hence in Kuchean *nā[k]* from Skt. *nāga* was used. In Dialect A 'monsters' are called *nāk* and *mātār*, both foreign words. It is noteworthy that in Iranian the Avestan *ažiš dahākō*, a particular *aži* 'serpent', supplied the later Mid. Persian *azdahāy* and Mid. Parthian *azdahāy* as a word for 'dragon'. It is therefore interesting to notice that the Chinese used 龍 *lì^wong* 'dragon' to render the dynastic name of the kings of Agni, and this same *lì^wong* to name the people of Agni dispersed in Kansu and the region of Qomul. The Sanskrit, as noted above, had the ethnic designation *agneya*. It does not seem too rash to consider the Chinese *lì^wong* as a translation of **okñi*. There are then two ways of understanding the development of meaning: (1) An animal name used as name of a hero ('the dragon' 'dragon-like'), thence a tribal name (cf. *Δααι Dahae*, *Dahistān*, and Khotan Saka *daha-* 'man'), hence to a name of the country and also a dynastic title; or (2) 'the dragon' as name of the king and as dynastic title, thence used as a name for the country. The Sanskrit and Saka *a-*, the Chinese *á* (which may be based on the Sanskrit form) and *uo* seem together to exclude a diphthongal pronunciation of the first syllable, but to favour *o*.

It is possible that the heroic name *Arjuna* may have seemed in Sanskrit a suitable substitute for **okñi* 'the dragon-hero', and so have been used in the royal names *Indrārjuna* and *Candrārjuna* (see

¹ A letter from Fr. von Gabain has shown this hope to be unlikely of fulfilment.

below). But we have also in a Kuchean document a royal name, *Kṣemārcune* (Lévi, *Le "Tokharien"* 23, where speculations are given; further developed by Fukushima, *On the Designation-Problem of the so-called Tokharian language*, 1935, 39). It should be noted that *-arjuna* does not occur in the names of the kings of Kuci listed by Lüders, *Weitere Beiträge*, 23, to which is to be added the name of the successor of Suvarṇadeva, 訶黎布失畢 *χá-liei puo-s̄iēt-p̄iēt* Haripuṣpa (Arousseau, *T'oung Pao*, 1914, 393). [This would suggest also an interpretation of Artep as Harideva, rather than with Lüders, loc. cit., Haradeva.]

If the conjecture 龍 *l̄'wong* 'dragon' = **okñi* (*Agni*) is acceptable, a further suggestion is perhaps worth noting down. The Chinese give also the Kuchean dynastic title. The Wei annals (quoted by Lévi, *JA* 1913, 2, p. 346) read: Les rois de Koutcha ont pour nom de famille Po 白. In the same paper, p. 334, Lévi notes the variant reading 帛 for this 白. Both were pronounced *b'vk*. Since we have the equation—Dynastic Title = Country's name—in the case of *Agni*, the missing member of the equation—Kuchean Dynastic Title 白 = Country's name—would be 'Kuci' itself. If then 白 here actually means 'white' as has usually been assumed (the variant 帛, since it has the same pronunciation, need not discredit this), it would be possible to conjecture that 'kuci' meant 'white'. The native pronunciation of the name 'kuci' would then be important. Chinese 龜茲 *kj'w-i-tsi*, 屈茨 *k'ṣuət-dz'i* (see Pelliot, *Tokh.* 86 note 3) indicate *kutsi* (possibly with *ü*), and 屈支 *k'ṣuət-tsiē* indicates *kutši*. Skt. has *kuci*, *kucīna* (*c = tṣ*) and Chinese *kutši* may be due to Sanskrit. Turkish *kwysn* (*küsän*) has *s*. Since Chinese could distinguish *ts* and *tṣ*, the native pronunciation may have been rather *kutsi*.

An Indo-European etymology of *kutsi* 'white' is easily found (no proof of correctness unhappily, since one could find etymologies for almost any combination of sounds in Indo-European) in the base *ḱeuk* (Skt. *śok-*, *śuc-* Iran. *sauk-* 'be bright', which supplies colour names in Skt. *śukla-* 'white', Av. *suxra-* 'red', cf. Khotan Saka *surai* 'clean'). We need not conjecture such a wealth of words for 'white' in Kuchean as Skt. shows with its *dhavala*, *avadāta*, *śveta*, *śuci*, *śukla*, *arjuna*, *dhauta*, but two words, as in Iranian, Av. *auruša-* and *spaēṭita-*, *spiti-*, Mid. Pers. *arūs*, *spēd*, would not be excessive, so that (at least earlier) Kuchean may have had a word *kutsi* 'white' beside *ārkwī* 'white'. A word *kutsi* could be considered an adjectival derivative in *-i* (cf. *ārkwī*, IE. **argu-*, *poysī* 'sarvajña',

Dialect A *wsi* 'yellow': *wäs* 'gold') to a word **kuk-* 'brightness, whiteness', from IE. **kuko-*, or **kuki-*, cf. Skt. *śuci-*, Av. *suka-*, *suča-*. In Kuchean and Dialect A *k* is palatalized to *ś*, presumably through a stage *ts* (cf. *ts* > *ś*). In certain cases we have *k* > *c*; after a nasal in *enk- eñc- ents-* 'take' in all three stages. *kutsi* would then be an earlier form of **kuśi*. Such a **kuśi* could be the source of Turkish *küs-* (in *kwys'n*, *kws'n*) with *s*, although here the development may be *ts* > *s*.

If this conjecture should be confirmed, it would not be desirable to seek *arjuna* in this 白. It would avoid the difficulty that *arjuna* is attested also in the names of Agnean kings where 白 has no place.]

The fragments in Dialect A were found (always associated with the closely related dialect of Kuci) in the kingdom of Agni and in the Turfan region. Once the erroneous confusion with *toçari* is forgotten, it is clear that there is a slight presumption that the place of discovery may be for these MSS. the place of origin.¹ Most of the MSS. of Dialect A are literary,² largely if not wholly translations. But one MS., No. 370, has a more prosaic purpose. The description given of it in *Tocharische Sprachreste* is inexact, and written at a time when the full document was not known. It was only with the publication of the whole by Lüders, *Weitere Beiträge*, 24–5, that the character of the document could be realized. It is necessary to quote it in full :

Recto

1. || tad-artham avasambodhayāmi yad ayaṃ mahātmā aparimita-
śubha-rucira-puṇya-p~~ra~~ mahādānapati agniśvara agni-
mahārājā indrārjunena sār~~dh~~am agni-mahārājñi-
2. yā suryaprabhayā sār~~dh~~am sarvai pañca-gati-paryāpanneḥ satvair
yo~~u~~ sau bhagavac-chrāvaka-saṃgham anena varṇa-gandha-
rasopetena āhāreṇ opanimamtrāmpayati tasmād ā-
3. hāra-pradānād puṇyaṃ puṇyābhiṣyandaḥ yaś ca kuśalaṃ ku-
śalābhiṣyanda tad bhavattv eteṣāṃ dāyaka-dānapatīnām dṛṣṭe
va dharme āyur-varṇa-bala-sukha-bhogaiśva-
4. rya-pakṣa-parivārābhivṛddhaye~~u~~ stu idaś ca teya-dharma-pari-

¹ It is almost amusing that the discovery of Kuchean Texts in the Kingdom of Agni (they were found also in the Turfan region and in Tun-huang, Stein, *Serindia*, ii, 915) has been used as an argument that Kuchean was also the indigenous language of the often hostile Agneans.

² *Tocharische Sprachreste*, introd. v, "nur in Büchern". Pelliot seems to have gone farther, *Tokh. 63*: quant au "dialecte A", il n'est représenté que par des manuscrits d'un caractère littéraire.

- tyāgāt maitreyānām sarveṣām bodhi-mārga-pratipamṇānām
 kṣiprābhijñāy_āstu tathā brahma-śakrādīnām catu-
 5. rṇām ca lokādhipatinām aṣṭāvīsatiś ca gandharva-kubhāṇḍa-
 nāga-yakṣa-senādhipatinām prabhāvābhivṛddhaye_stu : tathā
 agni-viṣaya-paripālakānām devatānām vyāgra-ska-

Verso

1. ndhākṣa-kapila-māṇibhadra-prabhāvābhivṛddhaye_stu : tathā
 kumbhādhipatinām śrīsambhava-lohitābha-kṛṣiṣa-svastika-
 -indra-prabhṛtīnām prabhāvābhivṛddhaye_stu : tathā nāgādhi-
 2. patinām maṇivarma-sudarśana-susukhaḥ prabhāvābhivṛddhaye_
 stu : tathā purṇa-agnindrānām ādau candrārjunasy_ābhyati-
 takālagatasya upapattivīṣeṣatayai-
3. r bhavatu samāsataḥ pañca-gati-paryāpamṇānām satvānām
 caturṇāhāra-parijñāyair bhavatu yac ca kiñci dyate tat
 sarvebhya samasamo dātavyam iti :— ||
4. pāklyossū pis-saṅk-ṣi ṇemi ṇaktas naivāsikāśśi tārmatām āyiṣ—
 kus ne ṇaktañ naivāsikāñ triṇemintu pāssi wrāpoṣ—bram-ñāt
 wlā-ññāt stwar sāwe ṇā
5. kciñi lās viṣṇu mahiśvar skandhakumārāṣṣ aci—viki okāt pi
 tāśśi nāñ yakṣāñ kumpāntāñ kintareñ kandharviñ tkam-ṣiñi
 epre-ṣiñi kus pat nu ṇaktañ

The Sanskrit, although not strictly grammatical, will be understood (it is paraphrased by Lüders, loc. cit.), but it will be well to add a translation ¹ of the passage in Dialect A :

Let it (i.e. the Saṃgha) hear. May the Jewel of the Bhikṣu-saṃgha give the dharma-dāna to the gods and Naivāsikas,² whatever gods and Naivāsikas have deigned to guard the triratna, the god Brahma, the king-god (= Indra), the four great divine kings, Viṣṇu, Maheśvara, Skandhakumāra, the 28 leaders, the nāgas, the yakṣas, the kumbhāṇḍas, the kinnaras, the gandharvas, whatever earthly or aerial gods.

The importance of the Sanskrit portion of this document was recognized by Lüders, but it is equally important for Dialect A. Its

¹ After Siegling, apud Lüders, loc. cit., 26, where, however, probably by an oversight, stands "Skandha, Kumāra" as if they were two different gods. Khotan Saka uses *skamndhā ayoṣmai*, Skt. *skanda-kumāra*.

² The *naivāsika* is known also in Turkish. Müller, *Uigurica*, ii, 83, has *niwasiki*, p. 80, *naivaziki*; in the Uighur-Chinese glossary *nyby-syky naiwasiki* is explained by 譯 'good genius'. The Mahāvīyutpatti has *naivāsika* explained as 'inhabitant'.

character is evident. It is concerned with a gift (*dharma-dāna*) by Indrārjuna king of Agni to the Buddhist community of Bhikṣus, and they in turn are exhorted¹ to present this *dharma-dāna* to the protecting gods, not only those already invoked in the Sanskrit part, but others also, so that the offering is now made universal in the portion in Dialect A. It is clear that both parts belong closely together. According to Lüders they are both written by the one scribe. Similar Sanskrit documents are published in this same place by Lüders concerning the kingdom of Kuci. This present document is however peculiar in its use of Sanskrit followed by a passage in Dialect A. To an unprejudiced reader no more satisfactory evidence could be had that Dialect A is the language of the kingdom of Agni. It is certain that the document was *written* in Agni. The sacred language is Sanskrit.² It is likely that the indigenous language would be the second language. This is not a literary document imported for study but a domestic concern of the king and the *saṃgha* of Agni.

But there is more. That the language was not a static dead language (such as a foreign 'sacred' language must be, as in the case of Sanskrit) is significantly observable in precisely this document. The forms *nāñ* 'nāgas' compared with the *nākāñ nāgāñ* of other texts (Kucuan sing. *nāk*); *bram-ñāt* 'the god Brahma' and *wlā-ññāt* 'the king god with *ñāt*, *ññāt* for older *ñkāt* (Kucuan *ñākte*) 'god'; *lās* 'kings' for older *lāñś*; and the isolated *wrāpoṣ* beside *wārpo* eight times and six times *wārporāṣ*, are signs of phonetic change, of developing language. Similar developments can be traced in the documents of Khotan Saka, where the older religious texts show a far more archaic language than the secular documents, and indeed than the later religious texts.

We therefore assist here at a living changing language. It is not merely uncertain orthography (as Schulze's remark *DLZ*. 1923, 47, "zeigt in seiner Orthographie eine im ganze bemerkenswert sichere und gleichförmige Haltung" might imply), but a later stage of the language, a fact of great importance for the study of Dialect A.

If this fact is fully recognized it will be found that all indications

¹ The exhortation (*pāklyossū* = "let it hear") is on the model of the Sanskrit rubric *śrṇotv āryasaṃghaḥ*.

² No. 414 contains prescriptions for the *poṣatha-pravāranā* of the *bhikṣuñis* (nuns). The formulae to be uttered are in Sanskrit, but the instructions are in Dialect A. Here too we shall see the indigenous language used to explain the sacred language. No evidence exists nor is there probability to make credible the existence of two sacred languages in this one country.

fit perfectly. Dialect A is the Agnean (Skt. *Agneya*) language. The MSS. belong to Agni where many of them were found. The language is closely similar to the language of Kuci, but not identical, as is natural in the case of two independent kingdoms, separated by mountains and difficult roads, whose independent history can be followed from at least 102 B.C. when a Kingdom of Kuci is mentioned. Hiuan Tsang clearly considered the literature and languages of Agni and Kuci to be distinct but he remarked that Bharuka had a language similar to that of Kuci. Kumārajīva (born in 344) translated *tukhāra* by 小月氏 who have no attested association with Agni or Kuci, therefore though a native of Kuci not acknowledging that the name *tukhāra* applied to either Kuci or Agni. Hiuan Tsang knew *tuoxūlā* in the west, and heard of ruins in the east on the southern route, but he does not associate the name with the cities of Agni or Kuci on the northern route. There is no evidence to prove that Dialect A was not spoken in Agni. MSS. of Dialect A were not found in Kuci (an *argumentum ex silentio*, but in this case of importance, since if Dialect A were imported, Kuci lay on the route; but if Dialect A is Agnean, the finding of MSS. of Dialect A in Kuci would be indifferent). Kuci was eminent in Buddhist studies, Kucheans, immigrants as it seems into the kingdom of Agni and the Turfan region (where in Sängim near Turfan, like the Russians with their inscriptions in the church in the rue Daru, Paris, and the English with their inscriptions in the many English churches outside England, they too wrote their inscriptions on the walls of their shrines) were clearly as interested in Agnean MSS., as their glosses in Kucheans show, as were the Turks, whose Turkish glosses are preserved in No. 394. A further decisive proof that Dialect A is a language of Central Asia, that is, of Agni, is furnished by the loanwords in Kucheans and Agneans.

The name Agnean¹ will be used in what follows for Dialect A. If it is necessary, it will be convenient to use Agni-Kucheans² as a name for the earlier form of the language whence are derived the two dialects of Agni and Kuci, including the language of Bharuka (*teste* Hiuan Tsang) and the possible traces in the language of Krōrayīna found in the Niya Kharoṣṭhī documents (Burrow, *JRAS* 1935, 667 ff.; cf. Lüders, *BSOS* viii (1936), 647).

¹ The name *karacharien* proposed by Lévi, *JA* 1913, 2, 380, and adapted to *Karashahrian* by Mironow, *Rocz. Orient.* 6 (1928), 89 ff., is taken from too late a period to be acceptable. For Agnean we have the warrant of Skt. *agneya* and the contemporary name of the country itself.

² On the model of Indo-Iranian.

Loanwords ¹

1. **ṣoṣṭānkāñ** is found in 222 a 2 :

lāñc āmāsāñ ṣoṣṭānkāñ sne-pältikāñ prakṣāntāñ
kings ministers officials merciless ² exactors

Tocharische Gram., p. 106, offers no translation of this word. It clearly represents an older form of the word in the third century Niya Kharoṣṭhī documents *ṣvaṭhaṃgha*, *ṣoṭhaṃgha*, *ṣoṭhaṃga*, *ṣoṭhaga*, an official title.³ So far the word is known only here and in the Niya documents. The consonant group *ṣt* is used for Indian *ṣṭ* in *ucchiṣṭ* and occurs in several indigenous words. It occurs also in Barčūq Saka, but not in Khotan Saka, where *ṣṭ* is written. The word may be an indigenous Krorayina word, but there is a likelihood that official titles should be borrowed.

2. **kātāk**, Kuchean *kattāke* 'householder', as a technical Buddhist term. The word corresponds to Khotan Saka *ggāṭhaa-* which together with Sogd. *krtk*, *krtk* is derived from a Prakrit form of Skt. *grhastha* (Hansen, *BSOS* viii (1936), 579-580). The Saka could be the immediate source of the word in Agnean and Kuchean.⁴

3. **ārśi**.

In 251b, a passage of the *Maitreya-avadāna-vyākaraṇa*, occurs the following passage,⁵ verse 4 :

kulmass or e- ṣokyākāl tane māñcām ṣ- -i <6 syllables> :
<7 syllables + metrak-ṣinām> opṣyaśśāl ṣyak kumnāssi :
ṣokyokāl ⁶ nām ārśiśśi kāsū tāki<ṣ- > . -c kaśal -i <1 syll.> :
<1 syll. + ṣokyā>kāl śrāddheśśi mā tiri naṣ māntātsi kār-
sāmantāp :

¹ Indian loanwords in Kuchean (Mironow, *Kuchean Studies*, i, *Rocz. Orient.* 1928 ; Woolner, *Sanskrit names of drugs in Kuchean*, *JRAS* 1925) and in Agnean (*Tocharische Grammatik, passim*) have already attracted a large amount of attention. Other loanwords have received occasional notice (bibliography in Schwentner, *Tocharisch* 46).

² Cf. the passage, 64 b 2 :

sne-kāruṃ saṃ lyalypu ñkāt
sne-pältikāñ cem ñaktañ kus ne cami

The context of 222 a 2 (description of an evil period of time) makes it likely that here *sne-pältik* may be parallel to *sne-kāruṃ* 'merciless'. In form *pältik* is, according to *Toch. Gram.* p. 13, 'ganz unklar'.

³ In Krorayina the *ṣoṭhaṃgha* was a tax-collector.

⁴ *Toch. Gram.* p. 13, curiously compares NPers. *kaḍ-ḫudā* (so to read). MidPers. uses *kikhwt-y kaḍay-ḫudāy* 'master of the house, governor of a province', but the second component is indispensable.

⁵ The contexts are not so colourless as they seemed to Lévi, *Le "Tokharien"*, 1. 6.

⁶ The variant in 251b has *ṣokyākāl*.

Translation :

. . . . greatly is desire thus

. . . to come together with Maitreya's consecration.

Greatly is it the desire of them, the Āryas. Good may it be . . . together . . .

. . greatly is it the desire of the Śrāddhas (believers). It is not the way of the Prājña (wise man) to be passionate.

The parallelism of *ārśīśī* and *śrāddheśī* beside *kārsāmant-* (= Skt. *prājña*) in a poem of the Maitreya literature assures the meaning *ārya* and *śrāddha*, both, as well as *prājña*, being Buddhist technical terms.

ārśī < Central Asian Prakrit **ārśa*-¹, Skt. *ārya*.

In Central Asia beside the Sanskrit attested in Sanskrit texts and in numerous loanwords in Agnean, Kuchean, Khotan Saka, Sogdian, Turkish and Chinese, a Prakrit is found in the Dharmapada MS. (MS. Dutreuil de Rhins), the Niya, Sāca and Krorayina documents, and loanwords in Agnean, Kuchean, Khotan Saka, Sogdian, Turkish and Chinese.

In Khotan Saka these Prakrit words are easily to be distinguished from the literary Sanskrit words. They further illustrate phonetic changes which differ from the changes undergone by Iranian words. It is therefore possible to know the forms of the Prakrit whence they came. So e.g., Iranian *ǰ-* is *j-* in Khotan Saka, as *juvāre* 'they fight', base *yaud-*, but *Śama* is 'the god *Yama*', showing Prakrit *ś-* < *ǰ-*.² The consonant group *ry* appears in this Prakrit as *rś* : in Khotan Saka *vīrśa*, Skt. *vīrya* ; *tīrśasūni*, Skt. *tiryagyonī*. In the Niya documents *ry* has been regularly used in the transcription, except in the one uncertain case 572 (covering tablet, reverse) : *suryadade* or *sursadade*. Graphically it is clear that a decision between *ry* and *rś* would be difficult. If *rś* is correct, even in this one case, it would be necessary to assume that in *rś* unvoiced *ś* had replaced the expected *ǰ* (however written) of *rǰ*, just as *k t p* so often replace *g d b* respectively (Burrow, *JRAS* 1935, 667 ff.). If *ry* is right, it could, if necessary, be understood as retention of an historical spelling. But the forms with *rś*

¹ For **ārśa-* one would expect in other texts a spelling **ārja*, indicating **ārśa*. Cf. (if they are not due to literary pronunciation of Sanskrit) Al Bairūnī's *آرجهد* *ārjbdh* and Abū 'l-Qāsim Sā'id b. Aḥmad b. Sā'id's *ارجهر* *ārjbr* for *Āryabhata* quoted by Gabriel Ferrand, *BSOS* vi (1931), 336, note 4.

² Single *ś* expresses *ǰ* in the older Khotan Saka.

in Khotan Saka suffice to show a Central Asian Prakrit with the change *ry* > *rs*.¹

It is evidently this same Prakrit which has given *ārsi* to Agnean. The final *-i* may indicate that the word had passed through Saka (nom. sing. *-ā, -i*), but this cannot be insisted upon.

It is well-known that in Central Asia Buddhist technical terms were often translated, whereby the indigenous word was given the full Buddhist meaning. But it was also a common practice to take over the Indian (Sanskrit or Prakrit) term into the language. In particular Sanskrit literary compounds are abundant, though they are rarely of linguistic interest. At times both methods were adopted, so that a double (or, if both Prakrit and Sanskrit were taken, a triple) vocabulary resulted. The following selection will suffice to illustrate this :

Khotan Saka arahanda	āṣaṇa-vajsama pajsamānā āṣaṇa- 'worthy of honour'	Skt. arhant
āryāṣṭāgamārgīnai adj.	haṣṭa padya beysuṇa pade	āryāṣṭāṅgamārga
Chinese 阿梨耶 â-lji-ja (and <i>passim</i>)	聖 śjāng	ārya
Kuchean, Agnean pāyti	Kuchean pāṣṣeñca	pāyattika, pāyitti (<i>Toch. Gram.</i> , p. 61, note 1)
Kuchean arhante	aṣanike	arhant
Agnean ārānt	āṣānik	arhant
kārām	lyalypu	karma
tārm (dharm)	pal, mārkaṃpal	dharmā
abhiṣek	opṣāly	abhiṣeka

To this is now to be added :

Agnean <i>ārsi</i>	<i>klyom</i>	Skt. <i>ārya</i>
--------------------	--------------	------------------

beside the literary *āryamārg*- Skt. *āryamārga*-.

In other contexts *ārsi* is not so clearly defined.

294 a 6, a passage of the *Maitreya-avadāna-nāṭaka*, is merely a fragment, but by its mention of the three jewels (*tri ĩemintu*), the King Vaiśravaṇa (*vaiśravaṇ lānt*) the *lokapāla* of the north, and the

¹ In Khotan Saka itself *rs* can indicate *rs*. If the Agnean word were direct from a Prakrit *rs* the change to *rs* would be due to the same tendency in Agnean, as in the Niya documents, to replace voiced by unvoiced consonants.

names of the disciples <Kau>ṇḍinya, Aśvajit and Bhadrīka, it is proved to be an integral part of the poem :

. . . opṣāly mātṇy ārsīśī tmaśśāl

. . . (*Maitreya's*) consecration, so that of the Aryas therewith

ārśi ype, occurring on a fragment without context, is clearly Skt. *ārya-deśa*. Tibetan uses *hphags-yul* = *ārya-deśa* for 'India'.¹ It is a phrase natural in a poem of Maitreya.

383 a 1 a metrical text :

: tām ṣurma ṣi ārsīśī kālkā-m ñom kl'

for this reason he went for the renown (? ñom klyu) of the Aryas

More interest attaches to the three other passages where *ārśi* is used, in Nos. 229, 230, and 236, all in the *Maitreya-avadāna-vyākaraṇa*. All three passages are autobiographical. It is probable that a Sanskrit original existed, but unfortunately neither this presumed original nor the author's name has been traced. The passages, 229 and 230, refer to the composition of a *kāvya* (230 b 2 *yāmit kāvvi* 'you are enjoined to make a *kāvya*', an injunction from someone styled 'great king' (*tsopats wāl*) whether human or divine, which the poet proceeds to carry out).

¹ Skt. *āryadeśa* is doubtless 'Central India' in *Rājatarangīni*, i, 315, where it is used in reference to the raids of Mihirakula, and the adj. *āryadeśya*, *ibid.* vi, 89, where a college (*maṭha*) for students from *Āryadeśa* is mentioned. In the proverb (Böhtlingk, *Indische Sprüche* 1025) *āryadeśa-kula* means 'a family of India', where Böhtlingk rendered literally "im Lande der Ārja". The Tibetan titles of two medical texts in the Tanjur contain the words *hphags-yul*, which Cordier rendered by *āryadeśa* (*Catalogue du fonds tibétain*, iii, p. 502). Mdo-hgrel 151, No. 5, was composed by *hphags-yul phatahahi sman-pa danadāsa* 'the physician Dānadāsa of Phataha in *Āryadeśa*', which is explained by the statement that Phataha is a place (*yul-gru*) in *rgya-gar dbus-hgyur* 'the central part of India'; No. 7 was written by *hphags-yul dbus-hgyur mathurahi rgyal-rigs kyi sman-pa raghunātha* 'the physician Raghunātha, a Kṣatriya, of Mathurā in the central part of *Āryadeśa*'. [Cordier gives in the *Catalogue Magadha* for *dbus-hgyur*, although he had earlier, *BEFEO* 1903, 628, rendered by 'l'Inde centrale (*rgya-gar dbus*)' and 'le médecin Raghunātha, de Mathurā, dans l'Inde centrale'. If *Magadha* is right, the Tibetan knowledge of Indian geography is inexact.] *hphags-yul* is here equated with *rgya-gar* 'India'. In a letter of 19.12.1935, Professor F. W. Thomas informed me that *hphags-pahi yul* occurs in the Ladakh *Rgyal-rabs*, ed. A. H. Francke, p. 25, l. 3; and in the sub-title of the *Dbag-beam-ljon-bzars*, whose author was born in A.D. 1702, ed. S. C. Das, p. 1, we have *hphags-yul rgya-nag bod* 'India China Tibet'. We shall probably prefer to render *hphags-yul* by *āryadeśa* rather than by the *āryāvarta* adopted by S. C. Das in his index. Professor Thomas has also pointed out that in the dictionary *che-rin-dbars-rgyal*, *hphags-yul* is rendered by *su* (read: *pu*) *nyā-deśa* and *madhyadeśa*.

2. yāmit kāvvi cam tū mā **kā-**
3. -lā mā tānḡḡāl :
4. yāmtse tāḡ oṅant nunak . . . mu skāt ṅi mā cimḡā :
60. 1. prasku lyalypūrāḡ mar mārḡkampal
2. tsopats wāl nunak :
3. raritwā kāvvi kos ne ime kālḡā ṅi :
4. kanis āyātḡā kuc ne mā tām yomu tḡaḡ arthāntu :
61. 1. **kāvvi** :
2. **kuḡānti** tākiḡ ṅi mānt ne mācār nkāltont se **kuḡānti** yaḡ :
3. tālo āknats -k āḡlu mārḡkampal :
4. nu :
62. 1. kuc ne kraṅc wraḡāṅ kārūṅikāṅ knānmānāḡ :
2. māḡ maṅk triḡlūne -**m** etstsantār :
3. tsrū **y-**
4. kw-ṅṅēṅc cam puk maṅkant tārṅēṅcam :
63. 1. kuc ne nu yomu tākiḡ arthāntwam
2. tākiḡ kākā-
3. -l :
4. tampe kālpītār kuliḡ tampe omāḡkeḡ klesāḡḡi :
64. 1. ā-

Translation :

(52) *In this way therefore for this composition of a kāvya, my thought and opinion went to the composing in the Ārya language in metre. . . . was clear in the composition of kāvyas (53) . . . all meanings to be well put together. Karma must be watched . . . the meaning is not watched . . . the Dharma also is transgressed. (54) He does not speak finely, the hearers love it not . . . they will arise Fear and doubt have come to me. Care and doubts in great number arose in me for the lack of words. (55) Therefore, not being able to compose at great length I have composed this with thoughts on the Dharma. I have striven to watch the meaning, but words largely failed me. (56) May I not have sinned against the good Dharma . . . I think however in the manner of kāvyas. . . . (57) . . . guided, watched, error comes accordingly words failed, others also. After these three I have striven the Dharma. (58) Because of these, I have composed the . . . kāvya, that I may share in the consecration of Maitreya they will be (59) “ . . . great . . . caused a longing. May you make the kāvya is not to be hindered.” I made accordingly it followed (?) me. I could not. (60) Through fear of Karma may not the Dharma however O great king, I have composed the kāvya,*

as far as thought came to me. In suiting the metre, if I have not here attained to the meanings. (61) . . . the *kāvya*. Indulgence be mine as a mother indulges her little son. Miserable, ignorant . . . learnt the *Dharma* (62) If good beings, merciful and understanding, find in it many faults, few may they overlook (?) and forgive all these faults. (63) But if the meaning has been attained . . . it should be . . . Let it be deemed the power of . . ., may the evil power of the *Kleśas* perish (?).¹

In 236 also there is reference to the *kleśas* (*kleśāśī nākām* ‘blame of the *kleśas*’). Then follows (much being obscure) :

236 a 7. *kālpintār skuntu tsālpiñc*

236 b 1. . . . *tṣanāk śāstrāntu* : 7

ārśi nu kāntwā ṣeṣ kar ne . . .

. . . *puk retwe yālymiññ atsaṃ tām ṣome puk śārsar* . . .

. . . *sne m- knāneñc yālymi pal kāntu*

. . . *āyāt wā neṣ sārki kupre māskantār ñi* . . .

. . . *knānmune wā . . -ṣ mā pe śāstrā tsoptsām* . . .

. . . *-l śāstrā naṣ kanam mā penu* *r-e ṣñi kāntwa-ṣi retwe* . . .

. . . *lto pat kuss atsaṃ ne āvikar -i naṣmi wr . . t . -m . yāmu* :

Translation :—

7. *May they find happiness (sukha), may they be delivered*
. . . *here the śāstras*.

8. *Because (?) in Ārya language is*

. . . *every composition*

. . . *they know* . . . *Dharma language* . . .

. . . *in suiting (the metre) sooner or later if I have failed* . .

. . . *knowledge* *nor in the whole śāstra* . . .

. . . *the śāstra is in metre, and also not* . . . *a composition of one's own language*

Sufficient can be translated to show the similarity of the context to that of 229–230 above. It is here specifically versified *śāstras* which are considered. The essential phrases, however, are the reference to *ārśi nu kāntwā* and *ṣñi kāntwa-ṣi retwe*. The ‘*Dharma language*’ is no doubt a reference to Sanskrit.

¹ Or read *kulis* as gen. sing., and translate ‘Let it be deemed the power of — (*kulis*), the evil power of the *Kleśas*’.

It is clear then that the author composed his *kāvya* (*ritwāssi kanaśāl* 'to compose in verse') in the Ārya language (*ārśi kāntwā*), which was not his own language (236 b 6 *mā penu . . . r-e śñi kāntwa-ši retwe* 'also not . . . a composition in one's own language'). If the original text was Sanskrit, the *ārya* language (like the *hphags-skad* = *ārya-bhāṣā* of Tibetan)¹ will be the language of *ārya-deśa*, that is, precisely the Sanskrit. It is then evident that the author wished to express his sincere if perhaps too humble feeling that he lacked proficiency in Sanskrit composition. This might mean an *ācārya* of some Buddhist country outside India.

It is interesting grammatically to notice that *ārśi* is here used as an uninflected adjective (cf. *Toch. Gram.*, pp. 251 ff., '*Indeklinabile Adjektiva*') in *ārśi kāntwā* and *ārśi nu kāntwā*. It cannot then be compared directly with the separation of the compound in *prattika cam pattāmāṅkāt* (*Toch. Gram.*, p. 250).

The word *ārśi* occurs also in the name of two metres: *ārśi-lañcinam* adj. loc. sg. 'belonging to the *ārya-rāja*', and *ārśi niṣkramāntam* 'in the metre *niṣkramant* of the Ārya(s)'. It is perhaps worth while recalling that Sanskrit also knows (a very different) metre called *āryā*.

It is difficult to see how in these contexts Sieg could have imagined a native name for Dialect A (*Ein einheimischer Name für Toḫrī*, *SBAW* 1918).² It is to be feared that regardless of context he jumped to this conclusion because at that time when Central Asia of the sixth century A.D. was still a nebulous land, he remembered the Greek *Ἀσίοι* and the Latin *reges tocharorum asiiani* of Justinus.³

The difficulties, historical and linguistic,⁴ which this has caused

¹ *ārya-bhāṣā* 'Sanskrit' is attested in the seventh century A.D. outside India, corresponding to Chinese 梵言 *b'ivom-ngion*, in the colophon of the Sanskrit-Chinese dictionary of 義淨 *ngjie-dz'iäng* (Turkish *kytsy*, I-Tsing, born 635), entitled 梵言千字文 'Book of a thousand Sanskrit characters'. The colophon reads: *cinā akṣara sahasra mālo ārya bhāṣa smapta* that is probably: *āryabhāṣa-cīnākṣara-sahasramāla samāptā* [or *śahasramālo<nāma pustakab>samāptāh*]. See Bagchi, *Deux lexiques sanscrit-chinois*, i, 1929, pp. 217-18 and 330 (= Taisho ed. 2133).

² Involving also a violent misrendering of *ritw-* and *retwe*.

³ Speculations on these *Ἀσίοι Asiiani* are at present of little use. We cannot be sure from the Greek and Latin texts whether the *Asiiani* were kings of the Tochari before or after their settlement in Tokhāristān. The name seems to have a suffix *-āna-*, which is familiar in forming adjectives in Iranian. It might mean that the *Asiiani* were Iranian or that it is a name bestowed by Iranians or a name which had reached the Greeks through Iranian channels. (Theories are offered by Charpentier, *ZDMG* 71, 347 ff.)

⁴ The most recent attempt linguistically by N. Fukushima, *On the Designation-Problem of the so-called Tokharian Language*, Memorial volume dedicated to Katsujū Fujioka, 1935.

subsequent investigators are notorious. But the second century B.C. is not the same as the sixth century A.D. in Central Asia as is now gradually becoming clear. Dialect A is Agnean without attested connection with the Tochari. It is regrettable that no one thought to examine into the basis of this unfortunate inference.

4. Kuchean **tvānkarai** obl., *tvānkarō* nom., *tvānkaracce* adj., is Khotan Saka *ttumgare* 'ginger'. It seems that the word was borrowed as *tvānkarai*, but the *-ai* caused it to be associated with the obl. case in *-ai*. Hence a nom. in *-o* was created on the model of obl. *witsakai* : nom. *witsako* 'root'. Iranian *-u-* is here replaced by *-vā-*, as by *-wa-* and *-wā-* in the following words.

5. Agnean, Kuchean **kuñcit**, Kuchean adj. *kuñcūtāšše*, *kwāñcūtāšše* 'sesame', Old Iran. **kuñcita-*, Mid. Pers. *kwnčyt*, EBalōči *kunčīθ*, Armen. *knčit'*, Khotan Saka *kumjsata*. The form represents an older stage than Saka *kumjsata*.¹

6. Kuchean **kurkamāšši** beside *kwārkamāšši* adj. 'of saffron'. Khotan Saka *kurkuṃ*, Sogd. *kwrkwnph*, Mid. Pers. *kwrkwm*, Turk. *kürküüm* (Rachmati, *Zur Heilkunde der Uiguren*, SBAW 1930, 19).

7. Kuchean **añkwaš** 'asa foetida', Khotan Saka *amgušdā*, Armen. (from Mid. Parth.) *angužat*, NPers. *angužad*, Chinese² 阿魏 *á-nqj^wei* and 央匱 *jang-g'j^wi*. From the Kuchean (or an unattested Agnean form) comes the Turkish *ñkpwš* (*ängäbüš*, *änkäbüš* (?), Rachmati, loc. cit., p. 16). Saka *-u-* is replaced by *-wa-* and *-šd-* by *-š*.³

8. Kuchean **kwārām**, *kwarm-*, Skt. *gulma*, Khotan Saka *gaumā*,

¹ Similarly a stage of Iranian older than the Khotan Saka texts is attested by the Niya Kharoštī Documents, where *rodana* 'madder' contrasts with Khotan Saka *rrūnai* < **raudanaka-*, WBalōči *rōdan* (Burrow, *BSOS* vii (1935), 787). In the case of *Khotana*, the change can be seen in older Saka *hvatana*, later Saka *hvaṃna*. The Barčūq Saka texts have *hvaḍana* 6, 6, and *hvaḍna* 8 b 6. Both words probably refer directly to the inhabitants of Khotan. I cannot suppose with Konow (*Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt*, pp. 30–31) that the writers were using the word of themselves. The contexts are not quite clear, but this view at least seems excluded. I suspect that *kāñcake* of 8 a 3 is connected with the name *kanjāki* (the word is attested as *knj·k-* and *knj·k-*, implying at least a Turkish pronunciation *kāñjāk*) applied to the non-Turkish people near Kāšyar. Kāšyari (i, 31, lines 5–6) remarks: *wa li-kāšyar rasātiqu yutakallamu fihā bi lkanjākiyyati* 'and the districts (*rustāq*) belonging to Kāšyar speak in Kanjāki'. I am indebted for the reference to V. Minorsky. We should probably recognize the same name in the Turkish *knč·k* **kāñčāk* of the Uighur document published by Haneda, *Toyo Bunko, Memoirs* vi (1932), p. 3, l. 2.

² Laufer, *Sino-Iranica* 361, who had first seen the connection between the Kuchean and the Chinese words, quoted the Kuchean without the final *-š*.

³ According to 慧日 *γ^wei-nčjēt*, born A.D. 680, quoted by Lévi, *JA* 1915, i, 89: C'est seulement en arrivant dans le région de *yu-t'ien* (Khotan) qu'on en voit.

gomä. Kuchean *k-* replaces Skt. *g* (cf. *kattāke* above No. 3) with *-wa-* for *-u-*, and *r* for *l*.¹ Meillet's hesitating comparison with Gr. *βουβών*, Skt. *gavīnī* is probably less acceptable (*JA* 1911, 1, 453).

9. Kuchean **arirāk**, *arirāk* 'myrobalan', Khotan Saka *halirai* < **haliraka-*, Mid. Pers. *hlylk* NPers. *halīla*, *ihlīlaj*, Skt. *harītakī*. If *r* has here replaced *l* (as in *gulma* above, No. 8), it is probable that older Saka is the immediate source. Hence or from an unattested Agnean form, the Turkish *arir-i* (Rachmati, loc. cit., p. 21).

10. Agnean **mahirṣāñ** plur., 'buffaloes', Khotan Saka *mahairṣāñā* adj. 'of buffaloes', Skt. *mahiṣa*. It is probable that the Central Asian Prakrit had *rṣ* in this word, or that the word came from Saka to Agnean. Inner-Agnean development of *ṣ* > *rṣ* under the influence of *kayurṣ* 'Stier' (so *Toch. Gram.*, p. 107) implies too great an isolation of Agnean.

11. Agnean **āṣām**, Kuchean *aṣām* 'worthy' from Khotan Saka *āṣana-* 'worthy': *āṣana-* < **āṣana-* < **arṣana-*, an *-s-* derivative of *arg-* 'be worth', Skt. *argh-*, *arhati*, as Khotan Saka *ḍīṣṭa* 'ripe' participle to *daṣ-*, *-s-* derivative of *dag-* 'to burn, to ripen', and Av., Mid Pers. *baṣ-* 'to bestow' to *bag* 'give a share', Saka *bemañe* (Tib. *bde-legs* 'welfare'), *beimañä*, *baimana*, *baimañä*, *bemañä* < **baṣ-man-*, Mid. Pers., NPers. *baḫt* 'fortune'.

12. Agnean **āṣānik**, Kuchean *aṣānike* 'arhant', derivative in *-ik* from *āṣām*, *aṣām*, No. 11. Khotan Saka uses *āṣana-vajsama* 'worthily honoured' and *pajsamānā āṣana-* 'worthy of honour' in this sense.

13. Agnean **mahur**, Kuchean *mahūr*, *mahur* 'diadem' from Prakrit **makhula-*, Skt. *makuṭa*, *mukuta*. Khotan Saka has a form nearer to Skt., but with aspirate *kh* (= *χ*): *murkhuta*. A Saka form **muhula* or **mahula* probably existed.

14. Agnean **parām**, *parn-* translating Skt. *pada* 'position, rank' (adj. *parno*), Kuchean *perne*. *Toch. Gram.*, p. 18, compared Sogd. *prn* **farn*.² Khotan Saka *phārra* < **farna-* 'position' is used in

¹ Similarly *r* for Prakrit *l* < *ḍ* = Skt. *ṭ* regularly: *kori-* Skt. *koṭi*, Sogd. *kwōty*, Turk. *koldy*, *kulty*, Khotan Saka *kūla*; Kuchean *kākori*, *kākoṭi*, Khotan Saka *kākaula*, *kākoṭā*, Tib. *kakola*, Skt. *kākoṭi*, *kākolī*. Cf. also *makara* 'monkey' given by the Kuchean *śaman* 禮言 *liei ngjvn* in the 梵語雜名 *Fan-yu tsa-ming*, ed. Bagchi, p. 297, as Skt. [elsewhere *markata*], Khotan Saka *makala*; Skt. *l* is replaced by *r* in many other words (*nīra* = *nīla*, *vipuriya* = *vipulya*, *ruka* = *loka*) of this vocabulary.

² *f* is certain. Buddhist Sogdian does not always distinguish *p* and *f* (which is possible by the alternative use of *p* and *β*) but Manichean Sogdian has both *p* and *f* and in this word gives *farn*, cf. Oss. *farn* 'luck'.

similar contents to those of Agnean and Kuchean, as Turkish uses *qut*, in *arχant quti* 'position of an arhant'; *burχan quti* 'position of a Buddha' (the latter in both Buddhist and Manichean texts); *šravaklar qutlari* 'positions of Śrāvakas'. It is probable that Agnean *parn-*, Kuchean *perne* are from an older Saka **pharna*. Sogd. uses *farn* in the same contexts.

15. Agnean **mātār**, Skt. *makara* 'sea-monster' (*Toch. Gram.*, p. 62, note 1, Lüders, *Zur Geschichte des ostasiat. Tierkreises*, SBAW 1933, 1017, note 1). The attested Khotan Saka form is *magara* E 25, 239 (*klaišīnā magara* 'the sea-monsters of kleśas'), but a form **matara-* is possible and would then be the source of Agnean *mātār*, Turkish *m·d·r*, Mong. *matar*, Manchu. *madari*. Since in Khotan Saka -*t-* in hiatus was probably not pronounced as -*t-*, it would be necessary to imagine literary contact to explain the -*t-* in Agnean, after the manner of French *dāsēž* from English *da:nsiŋ*, *dæ:nsiŋ* (dancing).

16. Agnean **yāmutsi-** (92 b 2 *kokāñ špārāñ yāmutsiñ* 'ruddy geese, the špār-birds,¹ the parrots', 70 b 6 *yāmutsiśsi kokāśsi* 'of parrots and ruddy geese') 'name of a bird', explained by Poucha (*Tocharica VI*, *Arch. Or.* 1933, 88 ff.) as the Chinese 鸚鵡子 *·pŋg-m̄u-tsi* 'parrot', which is found also in a Sogdian text from Tun-huang translated from Chinese (*SCE* 144, 315, 352): *ymwtsy* **ēmütsi*. Just as this proves contact with China for the Sogdian translator so also for the Agnean language. According to Pelliot, *T'oung Pao*, 1923, 317, and *SCE*. ii, p. 56, the use of 子 *tsi* as a suffix is attested from the third century A.D. to the T'ang period in this word.

The texts in Agnean and Kuchean are largely religious works, but in Kuchean other texts also, business documents and medical works, are found, with which Agnean has nothing extant to compare. Hence some of the foreign words appearing in Kuchean cannot be shown to have existed in Agnean. The existence of a group of words from Iranian in Kuchean and partly in Agnean is attested by *tvāñkarai*, *kurkamāšši*, *kuñcit*, *añkwaš*, *arīrāk*, and with these, *āšām* and *āšānik* are probably rightly to be associated. The *št* of *šoštāñkāñ*, as indicated above, does not exclude a loan from Indian or Iranian, but it may be an indigenous Krorayina word. It can at least be said that the word is known so far only in Central Asia. The words *mahur*, *mahiršāñ*, *mātār*, *ārši* and *kātāk* are equally Central Asian forms.

¹ Etymologically Engl. *sparrow* has been compared with Agnean *špār-* ['sparrow' is Skt. *caṭaka*]. Would such a meaning suit here?

The importance for Dialect A is obvious. Here are words of Saka, Central Asian Prakrit, Chinese and possibly Krorayina origin, which could not be from Tokhāristān. It is further confirmatory evidence of the conclusion previously reached that Dialect A is truly a language of Central Asia, the language of Agni.

[To this I am tempted to add the more uncertain evidence of the word **okñi* deduced above, p. 899. The Sanskrit *agni*, the Saka *agnye*, Chinese *uo-* and *á* (if this *á* is independent of the Sanskrit) indicate a simple vowel and not a diphthong. Kuchean *auk-* is therefore excluded. If **okñi* has been rightly explained, it proves that the name Agni comes from Dialect A, the language of Agni itself.]

CONCLUSION

It has been urged that *toγara-toχara* is the indigenous name of a people of the *θροαα-δρω'n* region, who are later known in the Bactrian region under the same name *toχara*. Their history thus coincides with that attributed by Chinese historians to the 大月氏 and the *tuoxuālá*. A remnant of these is still known about A.D. 800 in the *θροαα* region. The native name *toγara-toχara*, and the name *θροαα-δρω'n* indicate a polysyllabic language with voiced and unvoiced fricatives. In Tokhāristān they employed the Graeco-Bactrian script. They had no attested ethnic or linguistic connection with the northern cities of Agni, Kuci and Bharuka, from whose language their own, as proved by these, the only certainly attested words of the language—*toγara*, *toχara*, and *θροαα*—diverged widely in phonemes.¹

A second people speaking dialects of one language extended according to the linguistic evidence probably from Krorayina and

¹ Reuter's suggestion, *Studia Orientalia* (offered to K. Tallqvist), 1925, 232-4, that *ts* in Dialect A might represent the fricative *θ* would introduce an isolated fricative into the language. Reuter himself recognized that no positive proof was to hand, but he suggested three pieces of indirect evidence. (1) *ts* in *aptsar-* Skt. *apsaras*, and *samtsāra* Skt. *samsāra*. Both these words, a fact probably not known to Reuter, occur also in Khotan Saka with *ts*, *avātsara*, *samtsāra* (the latter also in Kharoṣṭhī, *BSOS* viii, 423, 427). The *ts* may be due to a Prakrit form with *ts* or direct from Khotan Saka. Since Khotan Saka uses *th = θ*, it is definite proof against Reuter's suggestion of an interchange in Dialect A of *s* and *θ* in these two words. (2) Interchange of *ts*, *tst*, *tts*, *tss* and *ss*. A value *ts* is equally comprehensible in these alternations. It is also necessary to remember that *ts > s* may mark the later stage of the language. (3) *ts* is treated as a single consonant and may be written doubled. Reuter assumed that this excluded the value *ts*. There is an obvious error here in supposing that the speakers of Dialect A thought of sounds according to modern phonetic analysis. The case of *c = tš* indicates a different point of view. This *c = tš* was considered as a single consonant and was written doubled in native words as *kucc-abši* 'what indeed' and *māček* 'ipsi' (*Toch. Gram.*, p. 180, 192) and in Indian (Prakrit or Sanskrit) words,

Niya in the south through Agni and Kuci to Bharuka in the north. It still remains to discover if a single ethnic name existed for these peoples, whether used by themselves or by foreigners.¹ Of their national names two, *Agneya* and *Kauceya*, are known in Sanskrit.

West of Bharuka in the north and west of Niya in the south, Saka dialects were spoken.

as in *viccā-ṣim* adj. to Skt. *vidyā* (*Toch. Gram.*, p. 54), as also *cch* in *ucchiṣṭ* and *murcchāntu*. That is, *tṣ* is written *cc* = *tṣṣ*. The adoption of *ts* for a sound felt to be simple filled a gap in the Brāhmī alphabet. Hence *tst* means *tts*, as *cc* = *tṣṣ* means *tṣṣ*, with which the alternative spelling *tts* agrees. The Chinese transcription of the name of Kuci as *kutsi* shows that *ts* was known there, and in Agnean *yāmutsi* *ts* represents Chinese *ts*. It must be noted also that in Khotan Saka *kh th ph* are used for fricatives (*χ θ f*), and that for Turkish *χ* Dialect A also uses *hkh* (and *hk*) (*Toch. Sprachr.* introd. xii, where *χatun* should be read for *qatun*). Dialect A was therefore aware of the convenience of this use of the Brāhmī aspirates. To express *θ*, *th* would be expected according to system in Dialect A. We may note also the proposed comparisons of the Niya Kharoṣṭhī Document *kitsayūsa* (a title, possibly 'elder') with Kuchean *ktsaitaṇṇe* 'age' and of *aṃkratsa* with Kuchean *aknāse*, Agnean *āknats* (= Skt. *bāla* 'ignorant, young'), *JRAS* 1935, 672-3. In these documents *ts* is used for Skt. *ts* as in *saṃvatsari*. Here too we find *th* chosen to represent Iranian *θ* in *thavaṃnae*, *thavaṃnae* (*BSOS* vii (1934), 512), Khotan Saka *thauna* 'cloth'.* There is therefore no reason to conjecture that *ts* is *θ* in Dialect A. The proof against such a theory is positive.

* A word probably known also in Kuci since in the Kuchean *Fan-yu tsa-ming* (ed. Bagchi, pp. 48 and 279, No. 537) *thacana* 'cloth' is probably a misreading of *thavana*. Here too *th* represents Iranian *θ*.

¹ It is hoped to take up this problem later. We have to recognize at least a cultural connection between Krorayina and the northern cities. To this cultural unity belong the three titles: (1) *gaubura* in a Sanskrit document from Kuci (Lüders, *Zur Geschichte und Geographie Ostturkestans*, *SBAW* 1922), corresponding to *gubura* of the Kharoṣṭhī documents, (2) *ṣoṭhaṃgha* in Agnean *ṣoṣṭānk*, (3) *cazba* in the Barčuq Saka, corresponding to Krorayina *cojhbō*. Three names may indicate even ethnic connections. In the Śacū document edited by Konow we have in the region of *Turpaṃni* (Turpan, Turfan) the people *Argiṇa* in the phrase *Argiṇvā bisā kamtha* 'the town among the Argiṇa'. With this may be compared the name Argiya in the Niya Kharoṣṭhī documents. A personal name in the Niya documents *cimola* probably appears in Khotan Saka, Ch. 00269, as the name of a people *cimūda* associated with the *hvaishu.ra*. It is possible to connect these with the *čumul* of Kāṣyārī, a people near Bišbaliq. It is admittedly impossible to prove they were not originally Turks, but it is possible to see in them a people whom the Turks had absorbed. The third name is *acuṇi*. In the Niya Kharoṣṭhī documents occurs *acuṇiya amcuṇi acu[ṇi]* as a personal name. The same name is attested as the name of a king of Kuci, in Chinese 阿主兒 *ā-tū-ñiē* **acuṇi*, quoted by Lévi, *Le "Tokharien"*, 22-3. Lévi proposed to equate **acuṇi* with Skt. *arjuna*, a phonetic equation which naturally seemed doubtful to Pelliot, *Tokh.* 72, note 1. We may keep in mind also the still uncertain Niya Kharoṣṭhī *ogu* and *n,wkw* of the Turkish colophon. There is also a possibility that the Niya Kharoṣṭhī name *kamjaka* is connected with *kančak*, see above, p. 913. In vocabulary we may, beside the reference to Burrow, *JRAS* 1935, 667 ff., note also Agnean *ṣiyok* 'strophe' beside Niya Kharoṣṭhī *ṣilyoka*, *ṣilyoga* 'urkundliches Schriftstück' according to Lüders, *BSOS* viii (1936), 654. It may further be indicated that a section of the 烏孫 *uo-sun* would probably solve the problem.

ADDENDA

I

The pages of the article "Ttaugara" were printed off in the early part of the year. The study of the Central Asian documents has proceeded during the succeeding months, and it is possible to suggest certain additions.

p. 883. The akṣara *ha* followed by the two dots : indicates Turkish *γ* (and possibly *q*). Hence *hvaihu:ra* **hvaiγur*; *-ttahi:*, *-ttaha*, *-stahi*, Turkish *taγ* 'mountain'; *uha:*, cf. Turkish *oq* 'division of a tribe' (not as p. 884, note 5, 'chief').

bādūmna may be compared with Turkish *puḍwn* 'a people': *ā* for Turkish *o* would be normal, and it is possible to conjecture a pronunciation **bodun* (after a suggestion of Minorsky).

In l. 78 it would perhaps be better to read *dūm va ucahi: spata*, supposing *dūm* to be the word *dūm* in *dūm samgalakā* of an unpublished text. *dūm* could be a place-name or tribal name (cf. perhaps the *dvan*, a clan (?) name in the Ṣacū region, twice recorded in a Tibetan document, *JRAS.*, 1927, 827); *ucahi:* could be a Turkish **učay* (? **učaq*); and *spata* could be careless writing for *spāta* 'general', which is attested both before and after names.

sūlya could equally well mean 'Sogdians' and so be added to the list of forms in *BSOS.*, vi, 948. A Sogdian colony is known at Lob-nor, Pelliot, *JA.*, 1916, i, 111 ff.

V. Minorsky has suggested a comparison of *iṃjū* with Turkish *inčü* 'appanage'; of *aḍapahūtti* with Turkish *alpaγut*; of *ttürki bayarkāva* with *türk* and *bayırqu*, a tribe of the Uighurs; and of *hātti bara* with 阿 咄 *χā-d'iet*, a tribe of the Tölis federation.

p. 886, line 9. Read -δ for -θ.

p. 890. Read *pr'tyk'pud* for *pr'ty'pud*.

p. 895. Read *Nagarāhāra*.

p. 896, note 3. The kingdom of Kuci (*Kuci raja-*) is known in the Niya Kharoṣṭhī documents.

p. 897, note 3. A. Freiman has written to inform me that document no. 15 of the *Sogdiiskii sbornik* is written in Turkish runic script, but in a yet undetermined language.

p. 899. Read also *Δaoi*.

p. 902. It may be useful to note that the "Four Great Divine Kings" are the four Lokapālas, Vaiśravaṇa, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Virūḍhaka,

and Virūpākṣa, famous in the seventh chapter of the Suvarṇa-bhāsottamasūtra.

p. 906. The Skt. *ārya* appears in the Sanskrit-Tibetan formulary (ed. Hackin, *Formulaire sanscrit-tibétain*, 1924) in the forms *a-r̥ja* ($j = dz$) and *a-r̥ja* ($j = d\check{z}$), and *tiryak* in the form *tri-ja-ka*. Hackin refers also to an unpublished Uighur Turkish text with *arja*, p. 102.

p. 907. Read *Maitreya-samiti-nāṭaka*.

p. 913, note 1. *kančak* is called *ga-hjag* in Tibetan documents, F. W. Thomas, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan*, pp. 118 and 133. Kāšyarī iii, 181, 8, quotes شَنِبُوى 'drinking, carouse by night' as a Kančakī word, see Brockelmann, *Asia Major*, ii, 1, 121.

p. 914. Sogd. *ptβy ščyṃk* 'worthy of honour' (ščy- derivative of *arg-*) renders 'arhant', Dhyāna Text 14, Benveniste, *JA.*, 1933, ii, 215.

p. 916. It would be safer to say: "toγara and θpoava do not exclude a polysyllabic language."

p. 917 (in note 1 to p. 916). Both *ts* and *tsts* represent Chinese *ts* in *yāmutsi*. *tsts* for *ts* has also crept into Skt. texts from the same region, see *JRAS.*, 1912, 355, and 370: *utstsukeṣu tv anutsukā(h)*.

p. 917, note 1. Read 'the town among the Argīña', not 'towns': *kaṃtha* is singular.

II

The present opportunity should be taken to supplement two other articles in this volume.

(1) It was noted too late in the "Fragment of the Uttaratantra in Sanskrit", p. 86, that *ukāṭta*, l. 22, had been misread for *uskāṭta*, which in Saka means 'above'. It is therefore clearly a direction to the reader to transpose the two verses of Sanskrit, as Dr. Johnston had already seen to be necessary, p. 87, note 11. For *uskāṭta*, cf. Siddhasāra, 5, v. 4: *aṃṣṭaṃ aṣṭaṃ ~ uskāṭta uskāṭta*, Tibetan *phyi-ma phyi-ma la sṇa-ma sṇa-ma*.

(2) Iranian Studies V.

Further work at the Khotan Saka texts has brought some clearer views.

agane was wrongly explained as 'powerless'. It proves to correspond to Skt. *ūru-* 'thigh', *vakṣas-* 'breasts', Tibetan *ran* (? for *bran* 'breast').

ayūla is Skt. *ayogula* in the story of Mahāprabhāsa in the Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā, fol. 167, ed. Lüders.

dīde is (in a medical text) 'languor'.

ěysä (-ä is frequently for -am) < *alzana- NPers. *arzan* (after a suggestion of Morgenstierne).

haugä, E. 2, 49 ; 17, 12, *hulgo* 'soft'.

kaba, Chinese 合 *káp* 'decilitre', Turkish *qav*, F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica*, ii, 82, cf. Kuchean *kawi*.

ñuska, *añuta* < *ni-yauk-* (according to a suggestion of Morgenstierne) or *ni-auk-*: -sk- unvoiced group indicates *k* not *g*.

pāja, E. 4, 26 ; 12, 35. *patārgya*.

phaṃnai, Skt. *tālu* 'palate', ? < older Saka **phatana-*.

šimga, Chinese 升 *šəng* 'litre', Turkish *şing*, Müller, *Uigurica*, ii, 82. Both *dva šimga* 'two šimga' and *dva šimga hālai* 'two and a half šimga' translate Skt. *prasthaṃ*. Since we have also *dvī mācāṃgyi hālā* 'two mācāṃga and a half' for Skt. *prasthaṃ* we may infer that 1 *šimga* = 1 *mācāṃga*. Then *mācāṃga* will be the Saka word corresponding to the foreign *šimga*: *māc-* < **mātč-* < **mātak-*, cf. Saka *āce* 'water-bird' < **ātč-* < **ātač-* or **ārič-*.

ysuma 'broth', cf. Paštō *zwamna* 'soup, broth', Morgenstierne *EVP.*, p. 104 (? *wa* < *ū* < *au*) to *zau-*: *zu-* 'pour out'.

The following errata have been noted :—

s.v. *gvīr-*: *guḍā* 3 sing. fem. (not 2 sing.).

s.v. *gyasta-*: read *ysānāhāñu*.

Read *haṃphīśāñä*.

Read *iharštā* with *ī*.

s.v. *khāje*: read E 6, 90.

s.v. *kūtāñä*: read Skt. *kuṭṭ-*.

Read *našpaštāme*.

Read *pāraṃgä*.

s.v. *pārysa*: read E 2, 50 *parysa*.

s.v. *pūhī*: read *pūhyai*.

Read *sambajātu*.

s.v. *ttuṃgare*: read *tvāñkaro*, cf. the plate *JA.*, 1911, ii, facing p. 120: *tvāñkarai* with *v*.

twāñe, produces flesh. Skt. *br̥mhana*.

Read *ustamjāñä*.

s.v. *vrri*: read *enema*.

POSTSCRIPTUM.

This may be the place to refer to two further contributions to the solution of the vexed problem of Central Asia. G. Haloun read a paper (which will, it is hoped, be published soon) to the German Oriental Society in Bonn in September this year. Pelliot in *T'oung Pao*, 1936, has contributed further matter of importance in an article entitled *A propos du "tokharien"*. From his discussion of the two Chinese characters 烏 and 俱 found in transcriptions of the name of Agni, it is clearly safer to leave them aside at present. There remain Barčūq Saka *agñye* (whence a nom. sing. *agñi-* could be deduced) and Chinese transcriptions indicating **angi-*. The initial vowel of the native name is uncertain: one can conjecture *a*, *o* or *e*. If we give greater credence to the more flexible Brāhmī script,¹ we may suppose a word ending in *-gñi* or in the system of Dialect A *-kñi*. Should it be desirable, a connection with Skt. *ahi-*, or the form with nasal as in Lith. *angis* 'snake', may be maintained.

It may be noted, in reference to p. 265 touching Agni and Agnean, that "Agnean" is simply an Englishing of Skt. *agneya* which the Agneans themselves used, just as "Kuchean" is an Englishing of the Skt. *Kauceya*, *Kaucya* used by the people of Kuci.²

The name of Tun-huang (discussed here, p. 262 ff.) will need yet further consideration. In this connection Karlgren's study in the Ts'ai Yüan P'ei Anniversary Volume, 1933, *Some Turkish transcriptions in the light of irregular aspirates in Mandarin*, will be of service. It will not, however, be useful to start from the Chinese transcription. Sogdian *δrw'n* interpreted by Greek *θροαα* can alone be accepted as authoritative. In Sogdian words *δr-* may represent *δr-* (or *lr-*), Old Iran. *dr-*, or *θr-*, Old Iran. *θr-*. The more precise Greek script (which was not unknown in Central Asia) could define the *δr-* here as *θr-*.

I am reminded by Hansen of the *twyr'kčny* in the Kara-balgasun inscription, § 19, and by Minovi of the *tuh'ryk* of the Draχt ī asōrik, § 42.

¹ The name *ταβγαε* in Turkish, 拓跋 *t'ak-b'uát* (or 拓跋氏) in Chinese, Greek *ταβγασ*, similarly offers *βγ* and *kb'*. We should probably prefer to trust the form in Sogdian script.

² Three unimportant points may be indicated here. On p. 261 the reference to Switzerland is due to a misunderstanding of the phrase "identical language": Swiss *kē* 'been' is sufficiently different from German *gewesen*. On p. 264 the earlier explanation of Syriac *thwrstn* is repeated without reference to the essential difficulty, the absence of *w* in the first syllable. On the same page, lines 3-4 are not strictly correct, since neither of the two erroneous forms (due to an error in copying, since no originality was sought in the Chinese conjectural reconstructions) entered into the following discussion, and *t'uoχudlá* was attested by the third Chinese transcription.