

## THE LANGUAGE OF ANCIENT KHOTAN

By F. W. THOMAS

### A. Tibetan documents. Names of the Country and City

In Rockhill's *Life of the Buddha* we are told (p. 236) in the words of the Tibetan *Annals of Khotan* (*Li-yul-gyi-lo-rgyus*, *Bstan-lgyur*, *Mdo*, 94, fol. 429 b) that—

“Li (Khotan) being a country half Chinese and half Indian, the “dialect of the people (*hphral-skad*) is neither Indian nor Chinese “(*i. e.*, a mixture of two). The letters resemble those of India “(*Rgya*). The habits of the people are very similar to those of “China. The religion and the sacred (*clerical*) language are very “similar to those of India.”

“As to the popular dialect of Li, it was taught to some cattle-herders of the Tsar-ma country by the Bodhisattva Mañjuçri, “who had assumed human form and the name of Vairochana, “and from this place it spread over the rest of the country. The “modern language was introduced by the Aryas (Buddhist mission-“aries)!”

Although this translation is in general correct, it seems necessary to revise and complete it, so as to read as follows:—

“Li being a country where India and China meet, the common “language (*hphral-skad*) agrees neither with India nor with China. “The letters severally agree with India (*Rgya*, erroneous for *Rgya-gar*). The manners of the laity agree for the most part with “China. The clerical manners and the clerical language agree “for the most part with India.”

“As for the common speech of Li, originally it was taught by “the Bodhisattva Mañjuçrī, who had taken the shape of a teacher “of language to pupils, and the name Vairocana, to children, the “cattle-herd boy Hjes and Mu-le-Ijji, these two and others; and in

"the district Tsar-ma arose the language of Li. When it had been taught to all, the two children, upon enquiry as to their whereabouts, were non-est; and as to the Li language, *wah-ma*, "it was continuously taught by the Āryas" (*Li-shad-kyañ-wah-ma-lphags-pa-ruams-kyis-brtan-cin-bslabs*).

The date of this statement is given by its author in precise terms as "the last intercalary month of the Dog year, 1256 years from the introduction of the Dharma by Vijaya-Sambhava." Not being informed as to the cycle or the second element constituting the position in the cycle, we are unable to name the precise year. But, seeing that the introduction of the Dharma by Vijaya-Sambhava is held by the writer to have taken place  $30 + 19 + 164 = 214$  years after the accession of Aśoka, this would give, according to the modern dating of that event (B. C. 274), the year 1196 A. D. as the time of the composition. The period of  $1256 + 165 = 1421$  years harmonizes not ill with the statement that from the first king Kustana to the last, obvious contemporary, king Btsan-bzañ-btsan-la-brtan there were 56 generations of kings and one deputy: for the average is about 25 years.

Nevertheless, the date is certainly too late by some 150 or 200 years. For the last king, Btsan-bzañ-btsan-la-brtan, is clearly a Tibetan; and we can hardly admit a persistence of Tibetan rule in Khotan down to the end of the twelfth century A. D. If we could suppose the figure 165 (the number of years from Kustana's accession to the introduction of the Dharma) to have been wrongly included in the 1256, we should arrive at a date,  $1196 - 165 = \text{circa } 1030$  A. D., which would have a fair plausibility.

A difficulty is caused by the existence in the collection of Professor Pelliot (No. 2139, at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris) of a Chinese translation, executed by a monk Fa-ch'eng of Kan-su, of a Tibetan text having at any rate partly identical contents (*Journal Asiatique*, 1914, II, p. 144; *T'oung-Pao*, 1920—1, pp. 330—1). If Professor Pelliot is right in assigning the translation to the first half of the 9th century A. D., there arises a critical question which can be examined only when we are in possession of translations of both versions.

As regards the general credibility of the contents, we are informed (fol. 429b) that the Annals were composed after hearing the statements (*bkah-mchid*) of the Pañčits (*mkhan-po*) of successive generations

and carefully examining the text (*yi-ge*) of the *vyākaraṇas* (*lui-bstan*) of the Āryas and the pedigree (*rgyal-rabs = vanśāvuli*) of the kings. The character of the work entirely confirms this statement; and it is clear that there had been consultation of the traditions of the several monasteries, whose records of their own foundation would certainly be in the main reliable. The narratives of Fa-hian, Sung-yun, and Hiuan-Tsang are in general agreement with the contents of the Annals.

In what follows we shall refer to four documents, which we may cite numerically as follows:—

- I. *Gośṅga-vyākaraṇa* (Tib. *Glai-ru-lui-bstan*, *Bkah-hgyur*, Mdo, 30, foll. 336—354).
- II. *Arhat-Saṃghavardhana-vyākaraṇa* (Tib. *Dgra-bcom-pa-Dge-hdun-hphel-gyi-lui-bstan*, *Bstan-hgyur*, Mdo, 94, foll. 412b—420b).
- III. *Lihī-yul-gyi-lui-bstan* (*Vyākaraṇa of Li-yul*; *ibid.*, foll. 420b to 424a (?))
- IV. *Li-yul-gyi-lo-rgyus* ("Annals of Li-Yul." *ibid.* foll. 424a(?)—443a).

As has been remarked by Cordier (*Catalogue of the Bstan-hgyur*, VI, p. 433) and others, the line of demarcation between Nos. III and IV is indistinct.

In connection with the language of Khotan the four documents present two preliminary problems, that of the language in which they were themselves composed and that of the name of the country to which they relate.

As regards the language, it will be observed, first, that one of the documents is found in the *Bkah-hgyur*, or canon of inspired texts, and is reckoned as a *sūtra* (Mdo 30, 336—354). Rockhill's authority for the statement (p. 231) that it was translated from the language of Li-yul is not known to me. I have not found a colophon with any such indication. It is plain, however, that the choice is between that language and the Sanskrit. For it is inconceivable that the names which the text presents should have retained the approximately correct forms which they have, if they had been written in any but the Brāhmī alphabet (or a derivative), or had passed through the Turki or other languages represented by fragments from Eastern Turkestan. What turns the scale against the Sanskrit is the fact that the text contains a number of names in the native form, some of which at least would hardly have occurred in a Sanskrit version. For, even if we may suppose that the name of the Vihāra *Bi-si-mo-ña* had not

been Sanskritized (whereas other such names had) because its meaning was not comprehended, and the same may be said of names of localities, such as *Śen-za*, *Ño-mo-ña* and others, the Tibetan translators could hardly in a Sanskrit text have found the names *Phyi-(e)-se* or *Kaḥi-lañ* (or *Kiḥu-laiñ*), of which the former appears to represent Vairocana or Vaiśramaṇa (or, at the very least, was a famous statue of *some* Buddha), while the latter stands in all probability for Kapila (Kavila). The authors must have known, even if their Tibetan translators did not, what were the Sanskrit originals of these names. To Tibetan translators, again, we might be tempted to ascribe the misunderstanding which transformed the name of the famous *Gośirṣa* hill into *Gośrūga*; but this would be an injustice, since the form *Gośrūga* is given also by Hiuan-Tsang and still earlier by the *Sūryagarbha-sūtra* (S. Lévi, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, V, p. 257). Its origin must have been local.

Concerning the other three (two) texts we have a Tibetan statement (Index volume of the *Bstan-hgyur*, fol. 145 a) that "these two seem to have become translated from Li-yul (language) (*Hdi-gñis-Liḥi-yul-nas-hgyur-ba-yin-pa-hdraho*); and, if they are translations, this must in any case be the fact. The multitude of local names, given for the most part correctly, could scarcely have passed into the Tibetan through another language; and the use of the local name (*Hgebu-to-śan*) of the *Gośirṣa* hill and the occurrence of actual etymologies in that language (though of one also in Sanskrit) are convincing. Moreover, the names even of the monasteries are nearly all local, although many of them must have existed in a Sanskrit form.

We ought not to pass over the possibility that one of the documents, the most important, namely the *Annals* (IV) is not a translation at all, but was composed in Tibetan. In favour of such a hypothesis we may cite the facts, 1. that the work was composed in the time of a Tibetan king, 2. that the style shows no evidence of composition in another language, 3. that there are references to words as belonging to the language of Li, 4. that the Chinese version to which we have referred was made from the Tibetan, 5. that the foundation of one monastery is mentioned (IV, fol. 439b) as contemporary with the famous Tibetan general (*Hgar-blon*) *Btsan-ñin-guñ-ston*, who was governing Khotan for his master *Sron-btsan-sgampo* (see *Śarat Chandra Das*, J.A.S.B., LV, pp. 198—9, note), 6. that

many of the local names are furnished with superfluous Tibetan consonants, designed to facilitate the pronunciation. On the other hand we must allow due weight to the remark of the *Bstan-hgyur* Index that "these two seem to have been translated from Li-yul." Although inclined to view the Tibetan as original, we do not seem to have the means of deciding this question; and the matter is of no great importance, since the (probably clerical) author will certainly have been familiar with both the Tibetan and the local dialect.

A curious problem exists as to the name of the country which is the subject of the four documents. The country, which is not Khotan merely, but a larger area, appears in all the documents as *Dge-ba*,—the city of Khotan itself being *Dge-ba-can*—while the Tibetan name given in the documents II—IV is *Li* or *Li-yul*, "the Li country." If *Dge-ba* is a translation, we may suppose that it represents a Sanskrit *Punya* or *Śubha*, and was either a poetical invention, dictated by the religious distinction of the country, or based upon a local name of similar sound. Or a local name may have been directly translated by *Dge-ba*: or finally *Dge-ba* may itself be a transliteration of a local name. Among these possibilities we naturally incline to the first; for the name of the *city* of Khotan has never been other than *Kustana* or one of its derivatives, *Khotana*, *Huanma*, *Uthen* (if this last is a derivative) and so forth, and there does not at first sight seem to be any way of connecting this with a form suggestive of *Punya* or *Dge-ba* (*Gewa*). But see *infra* (pp. 6—7).

The Tibetan name *Li*, which means bell-metal (J. A. S. B., 1886, p. 193), is explained by *Śarat Chandra Das*, who sometimes records facts not ascertainable from other known sources, as a rendering of a word *Kaṃsa*, which in Sanskrit means the same thing: and Dr. P. Cordier in his catalogue of the *Bstan-hgyur* gives *Kaṃsa-deśa-vyākaraṇa* as a conjectural title of the annals of Li-yul. Unfortunately we have no other authority for a name *Kaṃsa*, which as a Tibetan phrase indeed (*Skam-sa* "dry land") would be a not inapt designation of Chinese Turkestan, and which reminds us of the *Kamśed* district of the Annals, probably the more northerly and easterly part of the area. On the other hand, the Tibetan *li* is perhaps old, and may possibly occur elsewhere, in the name of Li-thang: and *Kamśed*, as the name of a part, seems to forbid our positing *Kaṃsa* as name of the whole. See, however the note below on Tibetan *khar* and *mukhar*.

We are, therefore, provisionally without information as to the name by which the country was actually designated in the original text of the *Annals*. As regards Kha-śa and Kharoṣṭra, it will be sufficient to refer to M. Lévi's discussions in the *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, Vols. III--V, merely adding that the sages "Kharāśva" and "Khareḥuṣṭra" are actually mentioned in the *vyākaraṇa* of Li-yul.

But, why, it may be asked, will not the word *Kustana*, *Khotan* etc., which is employed by Hiuan-Tsang and others, serve as the equivalent of Li-yul? The answer to this is that the local documents never apply the name *Kustana* to the country, and use even the equivalent U-then with exclusive reference to the city, while for the country they have, as we have seen, another name. It is almost superfluous to add that the Prakrit documents published by the Abbé Boyer, Professor Rapson, and M. Senart are equally particular in their application of the words *Kustana* and *Khotan*; and that the legend of the birth of *Kustana* is attached to a site in the actual city. The *Kustana* of Hiuan-Tsang and others, therefore, merely exemplifies the use of the name of the capital city by foreigners with reference to the country.

But there is still a further perplexity. In the documents III and IV the city itself is several times referred to by its undoubtedly Chinese name U-then. Thus we have—

- 425 a. *dñar-ldan-gyi-groñ-khyer-khar-dge-ba-can* "the fort Dge-ba-can, the nectarean(?) city." It is curious that *khar* (and *mkhar*, too) has also the sense of "bell-metal", Tibetan *li*. See below.
- 427 a. *Hu-then-gyi-khar-lña-ldan-gyi-groñ-khyer* "the fort of U-then, the city of the Five," or "the five-forted city of U-then."
- 430 a. *Hu-then-gyi-dñar-ldan-gyi-groñ-khyer* "the nectarean(?) city of U-then."

On this local testimony it is impossible to question that the city had five forts; and there is something to be said for Śarat Chandra Das' suggestion (J. A. S. B. 1886, p. 195, n. 1) that it was actually named *Pañcavati*, as an equivalent of the Chinese word (*wu*) for "five." But then what are we to say of the repeated statement on the part of the Chinese (Rémusat, *Ville de Khotan*, pp. 19, 28, 30—1) that the *country* contained five large cities? It seems that we have unimpeachable authority for believing both that the city contained

five forts and that the country was distinguished by five large cities. Is it then possible that the country and city were actually sometimes designated *Pañca* and *Pañcavati* respectively, and that, when the pronunciation of these words degenerated to *Pumna* and *Pumnavati* (as is quite possible, since a change *a > u* is evidenced in the local speech), an obvious etymology gave rise to the Tibetan renderings *Dge-ba* and *Dge-ba-can*? As for the Chinese name *U-then*, which we naturally (but perhaps mistakenly) seek to connect with the word "Khotan," it may have been introduced into the place, or into the texts, by the people of the district or by the Tibetans. The origin of this Chinese name (cf. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, II, pp. 299—300) and the possibility of its having been thought to contain the Chinese word for "five" must be left to the consideration of Sinologists (but see below, p. 270).

#### B. Names occurring in the Tibetan Documents

In dealing with the linguistic question itself we must begin by discounting the Tibetan orthography, which in the foreign names employs superfluous consonants for the mere purpose of inhibiting mispronunciation. Thus in the names *Hgelu-to-san* and *Gcolu-na* the initial letters have the object of preventing such pronunciations as *Ghehu*, *Kelhu* and *Cholu*. Again, in Sanskrit words, such forms as *Vi-dza-ya*, for *Vi-ja-ya*, carry no implications for the local dialect, since almost invariably in Tibetan books the Sanskrit *j* and *c* are written *dz* and *ts*. Another peculiarity of old Tibetan writing is the insertion of a superfluous *y* (especially after labials) before *i* and *e* vowels. This phenomenon, familiar in the case of the negative *myed* (*med*), is represented in the documents by such names as *Phyi-se* for (*Phi-se*) and *Byi-za* for *Bi-za*. It is interesting to observe, as a proof of the actual independence of the traditions collected from different monasteries, that the same names are sometimes presented in variant forms: thus the same two different Arhats are named in connection with one foundation *Śi-la-ma-ta* and *Golu-sa-ra*, and in connection with another *Śi-la-ta(ha)* and *Hgelu-su-sa-ga(ya)*. Where necessary, we shall indicate the probable pronunciation by bracketed forms.

A further orthographic caution concerns the variations of vocalism as between *a*, *o*, and *u*. It can be shown that in the local dialect *a* had a tendency to the sound *u* or a dull *o*; hence the place which

the translations of Hiuan-Tsang give as *Somije*, and which in the Chinese of his time may have sounded *Samajña* appears in the Tibetan texts as *Sum-ña*. We have also variants such as *Plru-ña* and *Plru-ño*; and in some cases there is reason to discern a tendency to vowel harmony, perhaps due to an intrusive influence from the Turki.

Since the linguistic material presented by the documents consists almost exclusively of names, we may deal with it under the following heads:—

1. Names of the language and country.
2. Names of localities.
3. Names of buildings.
4. Names of persons.
5. Other words.

#### 1. Names of the language and country

In the quotation with which we commenced it was stated that the language was known as *wah-ma* owing to the *disappearance* of the two children to whom it was first taught. This folk-etymology implies that *wah-ma* could have some such meaning as “nowhere” or “concealment.” The former is from the turn of the sentence the more probable; and it therefore follows that *wah* means “somewhere” and *ma* is a negative. Were it not that for such a story, obviously ancient, a Tibetan etymology (even if the writer had been capable of the absurdity and anachronism) is excluded, we might think of the Tibetan root *sba* or *rba*, which has the meaning of “conceal” or “hide.”

The name of the country, likewise, is presented in the form of a folk-etymology, strangely overlooked by all who have dealt with this subject. The passage, which is cited by Rockhill (p. 235), may be quoted in an amended form, as follows:—

“Kustana . . . arrived at Me-skar. After he had arrived there, from India also a minister of king Dharmā 'Aśoka, by name Ya-śa . . . was in the district above (*i. e.*, probably, east of) the river of Hu-then (or, in the district of the upper, *i. e.* eastern, river of Hu-then).” And two merchants from among Kustana's following, their names being Śer and Zañ, having a cow nearly ready to give birth (or some cows mostly pregnant), the cow . . . on reaching the *Zugs-dam* (?) plain from Me-skar, bolted to To-la.

The two men, following after, came to To-la. The cow having been delivered of its calf, that country received the name “Cow-calf-delivered-region” (*ba-behu-hbrañs-pahi-sa*), *Ibru-so-lo-ña*. To the *Zugs-dams* (?) of Tō-la also was attached in the Li language the name *Śer-ba-brañs* “Śer-cow-delivered” (IV, foll. 428 b—429 a).

It is unfortunate that the passage is in some part obscure and the word *hbrañs* might mean either “give birth” or “follow.” But that does not prevent our recognizing, 1. in *Ibru-so-lo-ña* (*Brusoloña*) the name of the country, 2. in *bru* the sense of “cow” or “calf,” and 3. in *ña* an equivalent of Tibetan *sa* = Sanskrit *bhūmi*, *sthāna*, *kṣetra* and the like. And already we see that we are dealing with a language of the monosyllabic type.

The connections of the name *Brusoloña*, which in view of previous observations concerning the *afo* vocalism we may take leave to write in the form *Brusala-bhūmi*, may for the present be passed by. As regards the Śer-ba-brañs plain in the To-la (Mdo-lo) district, which, as we may see from indications supplied by documents II—IV, lay in the region east of Khotan, and probably in the mountains, it is curious that it seems to be duplicated in a place Sa-ser-brang-sa on the Karakoram route from Khotan to Ladak (see Dutreuil de Rhins, *La Haute Asie*. Atlas, Map XI). Its real purport, therefore, will have been something likely to recur on the hill routes of the Karakoram and Kuen-lun.

In the Li country certain subdivisions are recognized by the documents, namely:—

1. The capital, Khotan, and the surrounding district.
2. Mdo-lo and Me-skar.
3. Kam-śed (*i. e.*, Kam region).
4. Koñ-śed (*i. e.*, Koñ region).
5. Ku-śed (*i. e.*, Ku region).

Concerning 1. and 2. nothing need be added to what has been stated. Of *Ku-śed* we may say with almost complete certainty that its meaning is “the western (Ku) region.” For not only is *Ku-śed* definitely described (I, 345 b) as the west, but we are told by a Chinese record (Rémusat, p. 16) that the capital of Khotan is called “the city of the mountains of the west,” which seems to mean that the *Ku* in Kustana meant “west” or “mountains of the west.” *Koñ-śed* also is placed in the West (I); but being associated with Gyi-kyañ,

which may very likely be Kilian, it probably denoted the high country to the south-west. Whether there is any possibility of the syllable *Koñ* being connected with the name of the Kuen-lun mountains, is a question for Sinologists.

That *Kam-sed* is the north would appear from the fact that it includes O-sku, which may be Och. But the spelling *Skam-sed* suggests that a connexion with Tibetan *skam* "dry" was apprehended; and there are other slight indications that *Kam-sed* included the whole region of the sands to the north and east. Indeed it is possible that both *Kam-sed* and *Koñ-sed* are Tibetan designations; for *koñ* in Tibetan means "ravine," and the Tibetans have a somewhat analogous division of their own country into regions of *thai* (plateau), *librog* (upland pastures), *roñ* (ravine), and *sgañ* (downs). That the terms should be Tibetan may not be inconsistent with their having been Khotani also; but the possibility deprives them of value as linguistic evidence. The word *Ku*, on the other hand, is not Tibetan.

It would be irrelevant, and also beyond my competence, to enter into a discussion of the names of peoples and places outside the Khotan area. A number of them are well-known, or have been identified: such are the *Drug-gu* (Tu-ku-hun or Uigur), the *Ga-hjag* of *Su-lig* (Kashgar), *Bcu-guñ-pan* or *Cu-gou-pan* (in Indian forms Cugopa, Cugupa, Cakoka, in Chinese Chu-chü-pan etc.) = Karghalik. *Thor-khoñ* (I. 346 b) is Kuca, and this proves that the Vihāra *Di(ni)-na-dzja*, which is mentioned in the same passage, is Niya, the *Ni-jang* of the Chinese and the *Nina* of the Prakrit documents. The Chinese and the modern forms of the name suffice to prove that the proper designation was *Ni-ña*.

In *Ni-ña* and *Pha-ña* we need not hesitate to recognize the syllable *ña* to which we have already ascribed an equivalence to the Sanskrit *bhūmi*, *sthāna* etc. The *Pha-san* mountains (II), on the way from Me-skar to Tshal-byi, in Tibet, would clearly contain, like *Hgehü-to-san*, the Chinese word (*shan*) for "mountain." That *Phye-ma*, Hiuan-Tsang's *P'i-mo* (long ago recognized as identical with Marco Polo's *Pein*), has a *suffixal ma*, is evident from many parallels, among which we may mention *Tsar-ma*, *Calma(dana)*, the river *Go-ma*, and the language *wah-ma*. "From Gyil-kyañ to Koñ-sed and Durya" (IV) is, if Gyil-kyañ is Kilian, a strong suggestion of an equivalence *Durya* = *Duwa* (see the map). A termination *rya* is to be seen in the name of the

Khotan locality *Potarya* (IV) and in a *Caṃsatarya*, furnished by the Prakrit documents. Let us suppose it to be a derivative with *ya* from a form in *-r*, and let us boldly suggest that the *r* too, in *Potarya*, and in *Caṃsatarya* and the name of the monastery *Ka-sar*, and further in a host of other cases, is a Locative-Dative suffix: then we may suppose that *Duwa*, if it cannot come from *Durya*, comes from a 'Nominative' *Du*. For such a Locative-Dative suffix we shall not have far to look: it exists in Tibetan and in Burushaski (Dative) and in the whole range of the Ghalchah dialects—we may say, more widely still. And the employment of Locative-Dative forms of place-names for their nominatives is a recognized phenomenon (Δελφοί, Ἀθήναι, Stamboul).

The last country that we need mention is the kingdom of *Nam* with its king *Hu-mar* (*Nam-gyi-rgyal-po-Hu-mar-bya-ba*). It is tempting to suppose that we have here the same word which appears (from the early centuries A. D.) in the name of the Nam-shan (Chinese Nan-shan) mountains. The place itself may possibly be identified with the Nan or Nan-hu of Sir M. A. Stein's *Serindia* (II, 617 sqq.). But here we are going outside the Khotan area.

May we not claim that the monosyllabic character of the old Khotan speech is already considerably more than a suggestion?

Coming now to the Khotan district itself, we have first the capital Kustana or U-then. The name *Kustana* is commonly regarded as an etymological fiction, designed to account for an actually current form *Khotana*. This, however, can by no means be the case. We need lay no stress upon the fact that the word *Kustañaga*, "a man of Khotan," occurs in the Prakrit documents. But it is difficult to see how an original form *Khotana* can ever have given rise to the legend of "Earth-nipple." The decisive facts, however, are that in the district we have another *-stana* associated with a similar legend. This is *Ārya-stana* on the Gośrṅga hill (*infra*, p. 12). It is clear that *-stana* is a local form of the Iranian *-sthāna* or the Indian *-sthāna*; and we have only to cite the form *Cina-sthāna*, occurring in the Prakrit documents, in order to clinch the matter.

Whether *Ku-stana* originally meant "the place of the Ku people" or "the western town" (according to the Chinese statement quoted above) can hardly be determined. Another possibility is indicated by the statement (IV, 425 a 3) that Kustana was born in a place

(garden?) *Kus-po-yen* (*Kus-bu-yen*, l. 5) upon the site of the subsequent palace of Khotan.

We have next to take account of the three districts *Hgum-tir* (or *\*tir*), *Hdro-tir*, and *Sau-tir*.

*Hgum-tir*, obviously named from the river *Go-ma*, the Karakash, was near to the Goṣṛṅga hill and contained a famous *stūpa* and the Gomasala-gandha *caitya*. The district (*ljōis*) *Hdro-tir* contained the hill *Ñon-bgyir*, which was near to the lower, *i. e.*, western, river (*sel-chab-lhog-ma-dai-ñe-ba*), *i. e.*, again the Karakash. It was, therefore, to the north of *Hgum-tir*. It contained a little garden, *Na-hbod-bha-loñ*, which had been visited by Buddha in earlier ages. There also were the *Bha-va-ña* retreat (*bsgoms-pa*) and Vihāra which Hiuan-Tsang names *Ti-kia-p'o-fo-na* and places "10 *li* to the south-west of the chief city," the modern Bowa-Kambatt. In *Sau-tir* was the Vihāra *Hjal-mo-ka-ka-roñ*, which is probably that which Fa-hian places "seven or eight *li* to the west of city" and calls the "Royal-new-temple." To the same district belonged, no doubt, the *Sun-ña* Vihāra, the *Sa-mo-jo* of Hiuan-Tsang, "5 or 6 *li* to the west of the city," where is the modern village of Somiya.

In these three names, *Hgum-tir*, *Hdro-tir*, *Sau-tir*, it is obvious that the syllable *tir* (or *ti*) has the sense of "district."

We next come to the famous Goṣirṣa or Goṣṛṅga, rendered by *Glai-mgohi-ri* and *Ri-glai-ru*, whereof the latter name may still exist not far away, in the modern *Langhru*. Since the name *Hgelu-to-šan* (once *Gau-to-šan*) is known to be Chinese, we seem to be without a local designation for the hill. But we have the legend of the child *Mo-rgu-de-si* (IV, 431 b, 7—432 b, 1):—

Some Arhats from India, having settled at Ārya-stana on Hgelu-to-šan, induced king Vijaya-Vīrya to build the great Vihāra of Hgum-tir (the Gomasala-gandha). "Afterwards, while king Vijaya-Vīrya was engaged in doing *pūjā* in the Hgum-tir monastery, there was enquiry for a little lost child. After a search the infant was found near a *stūpa* containing relics of the Buddha Kāśyapa, which was in a little hollow (*luñ-bu*) of Hgelu-to-šan. The king asked, "This *stūpa*, at what time and by whom was it built!" He is then told the story of the *stūpa's* existence from the time of the Buddha Kāśyapa, it being some times during geological periods covered by the mountain. "Thereupon king Vijaya-Vīrya, greatly strengthened in faith, built on

the Ox-head hill the Hgelu-to-šan monastery. The little child having been released" [here insert from Hiuan-Tsang "from the *stūpa*," and add the story of the earth-nipple, Ārya-stana] and sent away, afterwards attained the fruit of Arhatship. In the Li country there was before him none who became an Arhat. Being the "way-shower," he received the name *Mo-rgu-de-si* [*i. e.* Sanskrit *mārga-deśin*]: from that first came the name *Mo-rgu-de-si*. Down to this day hermits and those who have accumulated excellent works of asceticism are entitled *Mo-rgu-de-si* (*Mo-rgu-de-sir-bsgo-ba-lags*). And, in fact, we hear of an Arhat *Mo-rgu-de-si* 'A-ba-ya-rdad (439 a, 7).

It looks as if the story of the lost child were originally based upon the syllables *gū-de-si* (quasi Sanskrit *gūḍha-sīśu*). But, however that may be, the paṇḍit *Mo-rgu-de-si* is evidently a duplicate of the paṇḍit Hgelu-to-šan, with whom he is associated (429 b, 4); and both are really the mountain itself. It is needless again to repeat the observation (J. R. A. S., 1924, p. 672) that in the Khotan country the names of persons, beginning with Kustana himself, and their surnames, are often names of places. The rationale of this nomenclature may be considered later; for the present we may with some confidence draw the linguistic influences that *de = to = śirṣa* = "head," and *si = śan = parvata* = "hill." It is hardly necessary to add that according to the Tibetan geography (*ap* Sarat Chandra Das, J. A. S. B., 1886, p. 202) "The Muhammadans of Khotan now designate Langri by the name Gorusheshi (*i. e.* *Mo-rgu-de-si*)."

The Gomasala-gandha, or *Hgum-tir*, Vihāra and *Stūpa*, on the bank of the river *Go-ma* (*chu-po-sel-chab-mgo-mali-gram-na*, 424 b, 4), has for its last member the word *gandha*, which was interpreted as Sanskrit *gandha* "scent" and may indeed be a short form of *gandha-kufi*: it may, however, be the *kanthā* "city," so widely found in Central Asia (Samarkand, Yarkand etc.). The latter supposition would, no doubt, imply an old settlement in *Hgum-tir*. In *Go-ma-sa-la* we discern two syllables in common with *Bru-sa-la* (*supra*); and, since the latter comes from *Bru-sa*, and also on grounds to be established later, we may understand the "*gandha* at (or belonging to) *Go-ma-sa*" (cf. *Calmasa* = Calmadana), *i. e.* the *sa* (land) of the *Go-ma*." Gilgit also is in western Tibetan *Bru-sal*, "belonging to the *Bru-śa* (Brutsa etc.)."

With *Hgum-tir* we must also associate the place *Par-mog*, which occurs (IV. 440 a 3) as a surname of the *kalyāṇa-mitra* Hgum-tir-

gyi-Par-mog-Hdzin-sen, who is, doubtless, "Jinasena of Par-mog in Hgum-tir." *Par-mog* occurs also in the name of a Paṇḍit mentioned in a Tibetan fragment *ap* Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains . . . found in E. Turkestan*, p. 403.

The Ma-za *Vihāra* and *Stūpa* and the Potarya *Vihāra* formed a joint establishment under the name *Ma-za-Potarya*. The location of the district (*yul*) Ma-za, "5 or 6 *li* to the south-east of the city" is determined by the statement of Hiu-an-Tsang, who relates the story of the silk-worms, with which it is connected. There is, therefore, no difficulty in finding a derivative of the name *Potarya* in the modern Potakla, which has precisely such a situation.

In this connection it is perhaps advisable to withdraw the identification (*Zeitschrift für Buddhismus*, 6, 185-6) of the place *Ro-zya* (341b, 5) by the upper, *i. e.*, eastern-river of U-then, with the *Lu-she* of Hiu-an-Tsang's story. We have no confirmation of the identification, which was based upon a mere phonetic plausibility, itself perhaps fallacious (see Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, II, p. 302). It is even possible that the Tibetan phrase *Yul-ba-ro-zya*, should be rendered "a district *Ba-ro-zya*," in which case it is for *Ba-ro-zya* that an equivalent should be sought.

The place *Hgu-g'zan* is stated to be on the lower, *i. e.*, western, river (438a, 3), whereas the modern Gujan, with which I have sought to identify it, is near the Yurungkash. Perhaps this is not a fatal objection. For it is nowhere stated that the monastery *Hgu-zan-ta*, of which the memory may be preserved in the modern Gujan, was actually built at *Hgu-g'zan*. The monastery is mentioned as *zi-bahisa* = *sānti-bhūmi*, which may imply an etymology.

In the city of Khotan or in its vicinity we have to take account, further, of:--

*Ño-mo-ña* (I), where the early king Yol designed to build his city, and where king Vijaya-Saṅgrāma built a *gandha-kuṭi* for the image *Chohu-pa*, which came flying through the air from Cu-gon-pan.

*Kus-po-yen* or *Kus-bu-yen*, the place of Kustana's birth and the site of the actual palace or castle. The syllables *po-yen*, since they occur again in the name of the *P'o-yen-to* vihāra, must have had a separate meaning.

*Ka'a-sta-hdi-ze* or *Ke-di-ze* (I), a market-place in the palace or castle.

*Hgus-no* (433b, 5), a little hill outside the palace and to the east.

*Na-hbod-bha-loi* or *Hbod-bha-loi* (434a, 7), a little garden in *Hdro-tir*, near the Ñon-bgyir hill.

It remains only to mention *Tsar-ma*, the site of the great mother *Vihāra* of Khotan, and *Haii-gu-jo*, the original meeting place of Kustana and Yaśa. These have been satisfactorily identified by Sir M. A. Stein (*Ancient Khotan*, pp. 161, 230-5) with the mound Chalma-kazan, near to Jamada, by the Yurungkash (S. E. from the city), and Hanguya, in the extreme east of the oasis, beyond the river.

It is evident that besides *ña* and *ti* we have to recognize in place-names other final elements, such as *-no*, *za* (in *Ma-za*, *Śen-za* etc.), of which we are not yet able to specify the value.

### 3. Names of buildings

Coming to the names of buildings (*Vihāras* and *stūpas*), we must begin by excluding some which, not being in the local language, are of no relevance for our present purpose. These names are:—

#### 1. Tibetan:

*Spoi-byed* or *Par-spoi-byed* (I, II) = Prahāṇa.

*Hjigs-tshogs-spoi-byed* (I) = Śaṅkā-prahāṇa (III).

*Hod-can* (I).

*Ye-ses-ri* (I).

*Dge-lidum-skyoi* (I).

#### 2. Sanskrit:

Maitra (I).

Śaṅkā-prahāṇa (III).

Dharmakīrti (I).

#### 3. Probably in some local and hybrid form of Chinese and with vocalism (*o* for *a*) showing the effect of Turkī vowel harmony (see J. R. A. S. 1925, pp. 108-110).

Yo-zo-hjo.

Zer-ro-hjo (named after a certain Za-ro).

Ta-ke-hjo.

Po-blo-na-jo.

'Er-mo-no.

Kho-mo-no-no.

Khye-šo-na.

Ho-ron-jo.

There remain the following:—



- a) ending in *ña*:  
 Bi-si-mo-ña (I).  
 Sum-ña (IV) [Hiuan-Tsang's *So-mo-je*, *Sa-mo-joh*, *Sa-ma-jñā*].  
 Su-stoñ-ña (IV).  
 Nu-bo-ña (IV).  
 Bha-va-ña (Hiuan-Tsang's *Ti-chia-p'o-fo-na*).  
 Phru-ña or Phru-ño (IV).
- n) ending in *na* or *no*:  
 Gcoḥu-na (IV) (pronounce Coti-na).  
 'O-ka-no (IV).  
 Ḥdaḥ-no-yo-no (IV).
- c) ending in *ta* or *to*:  
 Hgu-gžan-ta (IV pronounce Gu-ḡanta).  
 Po-yen-to (IV).
- d) ending in *-ma*:  
 Bžah-ser-ma (IV built by Vijaya-Siṃha).  
 Bžah-sañ-gre-re-ma (IV built by Vijaya-Saṃgrāma).  
 Byi-ža-gra-ma (IV built by Vijaya-Vikrama).  
 Gus-sde-re-ma (IV).
- e) miscellenaous:  
 Ma-na-ḥdi (IV).  
 Khe-gan-tsa (IV, elsewhere Hi-kwan-tsa).  
 Kus-phyi-'or-myoñ-nag (IV).  
 Na-mo-ḥbu-gdoñ (IV).  
 Ḥjah-mo-ka-ka-roñ (IV).  
 Dro-mo-ḥdza (IV).  
 Ba-no-co (I).  
 Go-ma-sa-la-gan-dha (I—IV).

Concerning these names the first observation that suggests itself is that a number of them seem to contain the names of persons connected with their foundation. This is obvious in the case of *Ḥdaḥ-no-yo-no* (built by *Ḥdaḥ-no-ya*), *Dro-mo-ḥdza* (built for Dharmā), *'O-ka-no* (for an 'O-sku princess), *Bžah-sañ-gre-re-ma* (built by Vijaya-Saṃgrāma), *Byi-ža-gra-ma* (built by Vijaya-Vikrama); and it is stated in the case of *Na-mo-ḥbu-gdoñ* (built in connection with a certain *Na-mo-ḥbod*). We are reminded of the fact that, according to the observation of Sir M. A. Stein (*Rājatarāṅgiṇi*, trans. II, p. 369), similar foundations in Kashmir were normally designated by names consisting of the names

of the founders, followed by the word *bhavana* "abode." In India the *Vihāras* and *Saṃghārāmas* commonly bore names ending in *-vana*, while sometimes the names referred to legends or special features of the institutions. All these varieties may have been instanced in Khotan; certainly the last, as is proved by names which we have in well-known languages, e. g., *Śaṅkā-prahūya* ("Abandonment of Fear"), *Ye-śes-ri* ("Mountain of Knowledge"), *Dge-ḥdun-skyoñ* ("Saṃgha-protecting" or "protected").

There seems to be no difficulty in interpreting the syllable *ña*, in such names as *Bi-si-mo-ña*, in the sense of *bhūmi* etc., which we have found elsewhere. It would follow that the first part of such names would designate persons or abstract ideas such as *dharma*, *sānti* or the like. In the case of *Bi-si-mo-ña* it seems, in fact, likely that *Bi-si-mo* is related to the *Bi-śa* (i. e., Vijaya) which appears in the names of the princesses *Bi-śa-Phra-ba* and *Bi-śa-Dza-ya* and the *Byi-ža-Gra-ma* (i. e., Vijaya-Vikrama) *Vihāra*. *Bi-si-mo-ña* would then denote "Foundation of the Vijaya Lady (Princess, Queen)." In the absence of indications as to the etymology of the other names *Sum-ña*, *Nu-bo-ña* etc., it is not possible in their case to follow up this clue. In the name *Bha-va-ña*, if, as is suggested by the fuller Chinese from *Ti-chia-p'o-fo-na*, it is simply the word *bhavana* itself, the *ñ* for *n* must be due to analogy, as in the word *Kustaṅga*.

For the terminal *na* or *no* in *Gcoḥu-na* etc. the meaning *vana* or *ārāma* is probable. For we have *na* in the name of the *ārāma* *Na-ḥbod-bha-loñ*, and *no* in that of the "little hill" *Hgus-no*; and in Tibetan, which may prove to be a related language, *na* means "meadow," "grove" and the like, and the same sense appears in *na-ga*, *na-kha* (cf. *nags* "forest").

Passing over the *ta* and *to* in *Hgu-gžan-ta* and *Po-yen-to* (an old suffix, of which we can at present supply no definite account), we come to the group *Bžah-ser-ma*, *Bžah-sañ-gre-re-ma*, *Byi-ža-gra-ma*, and *Gus-sde-re-ma*. Here we have a familiar suffix (*-ma*), and the recurrence of the word *re-ma* in *Bžah-sañ-gre-re-ma* and *Gus-sde-re-ma*, proves that in the former the syllables *Bžah-sañ-gre* constitute a separate member, and contain the name of the founder, Vijaya-Saṃgrāma. That *Sañ-re* is a perfectly credible Khotani name-form will be shown hereafter; and that *Bžah* is a late form belonging to the series, *Vijaya*, *Vi-dza-ya*, *Wei-she*, *Bi-śa*, *Byi-ža*, rather than an

independent word meaning *e. g.*, "king," is probable in the present connection. In *Byi-za-Gra-ma* the authenticity of *Gra-ma* as the original of *Vikrama* is proved by the *Gu-gra-ma* of the coins (Hoernle, *A Report on the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia*, Part I, pp. 5 sqq.): and here again the Tibetan would come to our aid with its *dgra* "enemy," *dgra-lha* "war-god" and so forth. In *Gus-sde-re-ma*, since syllables in *-s* are rare in the dialect, it would be strange if *gus* were not identical with the *Hgus* of the hill *Hgus-no* and the *Kus* of *Kus-po-yen*; for *gus* or *gus-sde* the meaning "flower" suggests itself.

We lack the evidence required for dealing with the other names. Only as regards *Ba-no-co* can we from other sources be sure of a suffix (*co*), though we may suspect the same (*ca*) in *Khe-gan-tsa* and *Dro-mo-lidza*.

#### 4. Names of persons

For a full examination of the names of persons occurring in these documents the space here at our disposal would not suffice. Moreover it can more conveniently be undertaken in connection with other materials. The persons named belong to different ages and peoples; and it would be necessary to begin by excluding those names which are not connected with the language of Khotan. Reserving the subject, therefore, for another occasion, I may here confine attention to a small selection.

The early king Vijaya-Sambhava has been identified by Professor Konow (J. R. A. S. 1914, pp. 345—346) with the *Hsiu-mo-pa* of the Chinese Annals (Rémusat, p. 3). Dr. Konow suggests a Khotani original *Hampfo*; and by a curious coincidence he quotes in support the analogy of the Khotani word *hamphūta*, representing the Sanskrit *Sanibhūta*. For, plainly, a word *Sambhūta* had actual existence as a name, the name, in fact, of the celebrated Thon-mi Sambota, Sambota of Thon, who was employed by the great Tibetan sovereign Sron-btsan-sgam-po to fetch an alphabet from Kashmir. Now *Sambota* is not a Tibetan name; and there is a good chance that it came either from Kashmir or from Khotan, the Tibetans being at that period in relation with both. If it came from Khotan, we can demonstrate abundantly that it is extended by a suffix *ta* from a shorter form *Sambho* (or *Sambhu* or *Sambo* or *Sambu*). Such a *Sambho* (or possibly *Sam-pho* or

*Sampo*—in later times perhaps *Hampfo*) is what is represented by *Sambhava*, and once again the appearance of a Sanskrit word is deceptive.

The surname *Vijaya* is a favourite in the Sanskrit area, not merely in Khotan: like *Fath* in the field of Islam. From early times in Khotan this would have been pronounced *Vīje* or *Wīje* (for *ay* or *yu* pronounced *e* in N. W. India see J. R. A. S., 1915, p. 96). This is, of course, the source of the Chinese *Wei-she*; and later times in Khotan brought such modifications as *Viśa* (in *Viśa-Vāham* = *Vijaya-Bohan*, ap. Konow J. R. A. S., 1914, pp. 340 sqq.; *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, VIII, p. 222 sqq.), *Biśa* (in *Biśa-Phra-ba* etc., *supra*) and perhaps *Bēa*. Is this another indigenous name disguised? Here the early Prakrit documents contradict. They furnish a different dynastic designation of varying form, *Fitugha*, *Fitumgha*, *Citrogha* and so forth; and this can be shown to be a name of a thoroughly native type. According to Hiuan-Tsang the succession of the royal family of Khotan had been unbroken from the first ancestor; and it follows that in *Vijaya* we have a learned etymology, furnished by the paṇḍits to the house of *Fito* or *Fitro* (quasi Sanskrit *jīta*).

Regarding the other royal names we must here be content to suggest that perhaps none of them, not even *Kīrti* and *Vīrya*, is Sanskrit in more than semblance; and we need not shrink from venturing the same regarding the other persons whom the legends connect with the country, not excluding *Aśoka* and *Kunāla*.

A second name which may have a linguistic interest is that of the "Arhat named *Sya-pri*, who," in the time of the early king Vijaya-Kīrti, "was spreading the religion (*chos-spel-baḥi*) in Kam-śed" (IV, 436 b, 4). The Prakrit documents supply the names *Mochapri* and *Dhamapri*, in which the Sanskrit *priya* will inevitably, but mistakenly, have been understood. The ancient teacher will have been known by a religious name; and it is, therefore, probable that the two syllables *sya-pri* correspond in sense to the Tibetan *chos-spel* and the Sanskrit *Dharma-wardhana*, a name shared with Aśoka's son.

Another ancient personage is named in the passage (IV, 425 a)—  
 "On the eastern side of the nectarean (?) city, the capital Dge-ba-  
 "can, is a holy (*hphags-pa*) place, blessed in a *vyākaraṇa* of Buddha,  
 "the *stūpa* of A-dha-ma, with iron chains attached. It is an abode  
 "of the Thirty-three Lords, and has for protectors the eight classes

“of Gods and Nāgas and so on; and, gathering at each of the  
“four seasons in a great assembly, the Saṃghas of both sexes  
“and the various lords of the land down to the present time . . .  
“make a great *pūjā* to this ancient *stūpa*.”

We may find again the name of *A-dha-ma* in the *Aṭhama*, *Aṭhamo* of the Prakrit documents (Nos. 379, 417, 419), a *śramaṇa* (*leharāga*, 379) named, no doubt, after the primitive sage or king whom the *stūpa* commemorated. But a further possibility may perhaps be mentioned. Since in the Khotan district we have (as stated above) cases of *a* > *o* or > *u*, and since also final *m* developed > *u* or *ü* (*Bohan* < *Vāham*; *Gyil-kyan* < *Kilpam* of the Prakrit documents, so that also *Cu-gon-pan* < *°pam*, and so forth), it is even possible that the name *Uthen*, if it finds no other etymology, may be derived from the name of this very ancient *Adhama*, as eponymus loci.

#### 5. Other words

Beside proper names the documents supply only a few words, and these cannot at present be usefully discussed. But concerning the *Mu-le-Hji*, who is associated with the boy *Hjes* in the story discussed above (p. 251), it will occur to every reader that the word *mu-le* probably means “girl.” It is therefore interesting to note the occurrence of *molei*, *molai*, with the meaning “daughter” or “girl”, in the Hbrog-pa dialects of Western Tibet (R. B. Shaw, J. A. S. B., 1878, I, p. 57).

The materials and suggestions contained in this paper are based almost exclusively upon the four Tibetan documents (of which I hope shortly to publish a translation). More abundant linguistic evidence can be drawn from the other sources. So far the details (formatives *ma* and *mo*, *ba* and *bo* [po]); case-suffixes (?) *la* and *r*; the words *sa* and *ña*, cf. Tibetan *sa* “Earth” and *ña-ma* “mistress of the house,” *ñe* “near” point to a connection with Tibetan. But the language cannot have been Tibetan simply; and we may think rather of the “Proto-Tibetan” conjectured by Hoernle. Not only the name *Bru-sa*, but a considerable number of other particulars points specially to Western Tibet.

By the side of the official Prakrit and the native *wah-ma* there was no room in Khotan for what is called the “Old Khotanese” language. When and by whom was the latter introduced? We may

conjecture that it came with the Brāhmī alphabet and that this occurred in the period between Sung-Yun and Hiuan-Tsang. For the former tells us (Beal, I, pp. lxxxviii—ix) concerning Karghalik that there “the customs and spoken language are like those of the people of Khotan, but the written character is that of the Brahmins” (*i. e.*, Brāhmī); whereas according to Hiuan-Tsang (Beal, II, p. 308) “the letters are the same as those of K’iu-sa-ta-na, but the spoken language is different.” Thus between Sung-Yun and Hiuan-Tsang the Kharoṣṭhī of Khotan has yielded to the Brāhmī of Karghalik.