

THE NAME OF THE "TOKHARIAN" LANGUAGE

by W. B. HENNING

Two words have been regarded as names of the old language of Qarašahr ("I A"), which is almost universally called "Tokharian" now. One, *ārśi*, found in documents written in that language, has been claimed as the indigenous name, used by the speakers of I A themselves; several scholars, however, foremost among them Professor H. W. Bailey, deny that *ārśi* refers to I A at all and insist that it is a foreign word, a Prakrit of Skt. *ārya-*, so that "*ārśi* language" should mean *āryabhāṣā* = Sanskrit. The other, *twγry*, known from Uigur Turkish colophons to Buddhist books, is responsible for the introduction of the name of "Tokharian"; the late Professor Sten Konow, supported by Professor Bailey and others, rejected the opinion that the language designated as *twγry* by the Uigurs was the language now named "Tokharian"; in his view, *twγry* meant an Iranian dialect, probably Khotanese Saka. It is proposed here to re-examine the colophons in which *twγry* is mentioned, without entering into the problem of *ārśi* for the present.

In an article published ten years ago¹ I endeavoured to settle the limits of the area in which the *twγry* language was spoken by having recourse to a geographical or political term, the "Four-*Twγry*-Land", occurring in Sogdian, Uigur, and Middle Persian sources contemporary with the Uigur colophons. It became clear that this "Four-*Twγry*-Land", presumably the home-land of the *twγry* language, lay in Chinese Turkestan, and probable that it lay "near or between Bišbaliq and Kučā" (p. 550), *i.e.*, precisely in the area where the speakers of I A lived; but the evidence remained inconclusive, chiefly because the one passage that in the nature of things could furnish proof, a paragraph in the inscription of Karabalgasun, could not be treated satisfactorily owing to the absence of a competent study on its Chinese version—may I once again appeal to Sinologists to turn their attention to that monument?

Two facts that emerged from that article may conveniently be recalled here: (1) the name of the country that has a right to the name of *Tokhar* in history, *i.e.*, the region of Balkh, was, at the time to which the Uigur colophons belong, sufficiently distinct from the name of *Twγry* to admit of

no confusion, (2) the second consonant in *Twγry*, which was probably pronounced *Tuγre*, was voiced (γ). The tendency to confuse different names on the strength of mere surface resemblance and with little or no regard to time and space is as prominent in recent contributions to the "Tokharian" problem as it was in the earlier ones; in face of it it becomes ever more important to stress diversity rather than likeness, confine ourselves to facts, and resign speculations. That the *Tuγre* language was misnamed *Tokharian* was due to such confusion; the identification, across seven or eight hundred years and five hundred miles or more, of *Tuγre* with the name of the *Θάγυροι*¹ noticed by Maës (probably end of 1st century A.D.) is equally purely speculative².

As neither the colophons nor the passages in which the "Four-*Twγry*-Land" is mentioned seemed to provide any decisive argument either way (even though the weight of evidence favoured the view that *Twγry* = I A), the problem remained undecided and the flood of ingenious hypotheses unabated³. It was with a start of surprise that a little while ago I noticed that the chief colophon, a text that has been studied and re-studied by dozens of scholars these last thirty years, did in fact contain proof beyond reasonable doubt⁴. This was overlooked because F. W. K. Müller, in his reading of the Uigur passage, committed a small error and all other scholars, feeling justified in taking his reading on trust, apparently omitted to check it; for the mistake is plain enough. I hasten to say that no disrespect is intended to the memory of this truly eminent scholar whose learning few, if any, can emulate. Indeed, he excelled in reading the Sogdian-Uigur cursive script, that invention of Ahriman's. Unfortunately, as all who have tried their hand at it can testify, it is impossible to transcribe a few pages in that script without going astray in some point or other. In truth, it was in a minute point that F. W. K. Müller was in error; the effect, however, on later research was considerable.

¹ A hypothesis to account for the resemblance was put forward in *BSOS.*, ix, 563 sq. The view now held by Professor Bailey (*Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1947, 152 sq.) approximates to it.—As *Θροάνα* = Sogdian *θρωάν* (*θρωάν*), the initial of *Θάγυροι*, *Θάγυρον* *ἄρος*, *Θαγάρα* *πόλις* should appear as *δ* in Sogdian; for all four names belong to one and the same report. The resemblance is thus only partial.

² It is to be feared that adventurous spirits will soon discover the hitherto happily overlooked colony which the untiring *Yüe-chi/Θάγυροι* would appear to have founded in Eastern Balochistan: Parthian *Twγryn* *i.e.* *Tuγrān* in the inscription of Shapur I. (line 2), beside *Twrgstn* *i.e.* *Tuγrastān* (instead of *Tuγrastān*?) = *Τουρήνη* = MPers. *Twrstn* *i.e.* *Tūrastān* (line 19 = MPers. line 24; also in Pers. I 3 where *twrst* instead of *twrstn*; Man. Parth. *Tūrān-sāh*, Armenian *Turan*, Arabic *Tūrān*). MPers. *Tūr-* is regularly developed from *Tuγr-* (by **Tuwr-*, cf. *murw* from *mury*, etc.).

³ For a list of relevant works see Bailey, *Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1947, 138 sq.

⁴ The point was made in a paper I read to the American Oriental Society at the meeting in New York in April 1946.

¹ Argi and the "Tokharians", *BSOS.*, ix, 545-71.

We can leave aside the colophon to the Uigur *Daśa-karmapatha-avadāna-mālā* (Sb. P.A.W., 1918, 583; 1931, 678), which tells that that book was translated from the language of ²*wkw Kwys²n* (Ökü Kūsān) into the *Twyry* language, and from that into Turkish. In view of the geographical position of the regions in which those languages were spoken (Kučā¹: Qarašahr?: Turfan) it may seem likely that the chain of translations was from Kuchean into I A, and from I A into Turkish, but it cannot be called impossible that the first translation was from Kuchean into some Iranian dialect².

The chief text, of course, is the most elaborate among the colophons to the Uigur *Maitrisimit*, Sb. P.A.W., 1916, 414, No. 48, and plate opposite p. 416. Müller read:—

Nakridiš ulušta toymiš Aryačintri bodisot kši ačari
Antkāk tilint(in) Toxri tilinčā yaratmīs
Il-baliqda toymiš Prtanyarakšit kši ačari
Toxri tilintin Türk tilinčā üvirmiš
Maitri(s)mit nom bitig

“The sacred book Maitreya-samiti, which the Bodhisattva guru ācārya Āryacandra, who was born in the country of *Nagaradeśa*, had composed in the *Twyry* language out of the Indian language, and which the guru ācārya Prajñārakṣita, who was born in Ilbaliq, translated from the *Twyry* language into the Turkish language.”

The mistake is in the first word, *N²krydyš*. The letters ² (Alef) and *n* are rarely distinguishable in the middle of a word, but always different from each other in initial position: here the first letter is ². Further, while *kn*, *k²*, *kr* can often be confused, the three groups are neatly distinct in this manuscript (cf. *kr* in *ykrmy* line 2; *k²* in *synk²r* lines 1 and 2, *ntk²k* line 5): here the group is *kn*. The correct reading of the name of Āryacandra's birth-place, therefore, is ²*krydyš*.

¹ Provided that ²*wkw Kwys²n* had the same value as the simple *Kwys²n*. Identity of ²*wkw* with the Tibetan ²*O-sku* was suggested long ago (cf. BSOS., ix, 560). I should hesitate to follow Professor Bailey in his proposal to compare ²*wkw* further with Chinese 𠂇 and 𠂈 = *b²vk* (*Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1947, 147). The only sound that is common to ²*wkw* and *b²vk* is the *k*. For a Kuchean word underlying *b²vk* we should expect **p²q* or **p²q* in Uigur. Chin. *b²vk* is a monosyllable with consonantic initial: Uig. ²*wkw* is a disyllable with vocalic initial.

² We know now that translations were made from Kuchean into Sogdian, see my *Sogdica*, 59 sqq. Moreover, a fragment of the Sogdian version of this particular book could recently be identified. Its title in Sogdian was *šr² sy²krtyh* “The ten good deeds”. The fragment (“T i a”), which is from the *pncmyk prwrt* “fifth *chūan*”, contains part of the story of King Kāñcanasāra (*knčns²r* in Sogdian). See Müller, *Uigurica*, iii, 27 sqq.; I. J. Schmidt, *h²Dzans-bLun oder Der Weise und der Thor*, ch. I, transl. 4-7.

It is obvious that ²*krydyš* is *Agnideśa* “the land of Agni” = Qarašahr; the form *Agnideśa* was not hitherto attested, but the equivalent *Agnivīśaya* occurs, see Lüders, *Weitere Beiträge*, Sb. P.A.W. 1930, 29 line 5. *Agni* is the sanskritized form of the name which originally was *Argi*, later shortened to *Arg¹*. Thus Āryacandra, who composed the *Maitrisimit* in the *Twyry* language, was a native of Qarašahr, where I A was the current language.

This clinches the argument: according to the colophons to the I A version of the *Maitrisimit* Āryacandra composed that work: according to the Uigur colophons Āryacandra composed that work in the *Twyry* language: Āryacandra's mother tongue was I A: hence I A is *Twyry*. There is no need to recapitulate here the reasons that led Sieg and Müller to the same result: they were weighty enough, and after forty years' discussion they stand almost untouched by the laborious arguments proffered by those who wished to attach the name of *Twyry* to some other language; their mainstay was the *argumentum e silentio* that there *might* have been in existence a third version of the *Maitrisimit*.

At the same time we can now finally dispose of the name “Tokharian”. This misnomer has been supported by three reasons, all of them now discredited. Firstly: the vague resemblance of *Twyry* to the name of *To-khāristān*; it would be waste of time to discuss this any further. Secondly: the proximity, in the colophons, of *Kwys²n* to *Twyry*, *Kwys²n* having been identified with *Kuśān*; since Haneda's much-cited article we know that *Kwys²n* was the Turkish name of Kučā. Thirdly: the presumed fact that Āryacandra was a native of Nagara = Jalalabad on the Kabul river, a place which, though very far from lying in Tokharistan, was at least within reasonable distance from it; now we see that he was a native of Agni.

The discovery of Āryacandra's true country of origin throws light on other hitherto obscure points. Why, for example, is this bearer of the grandiloquent title of *Bodhisattva* unknown to the history of Buddhism? If he lived in an outlying province of India or in Tokharistan, why is his *Maitreya-samiti*, a unicum in the history of Buddhist literature, not so much as mentioned in the Chinese Tripitaka and the great Tibetan collections, although it was read and studied in such out-of-the-way places as Agni and Turfan? The answer to either question is clear now: Āryacandra was a highly respected teacher in an insignificant little town away from the main

¹ The -r- in the name is attested in sources of so different a character as the Niya documents, Khotanese Saka, Manichaean Middle Persian and Sogdian, Persian geographers, and let us add, Chinese historians; for that *Yen-ch'i* transcribes *Argi* (or **Argi*) is plain (see BSOS., ix, 571). As far as I know, there is no warrant for **Angi* (Bailey *loc. cit.* 127). All other spellings derive from the sanskritized *Agni*; so also Kuchean *akeñe* in which I now see an adaptation of *agñe*, *a(g)ñye* in the Murtuq document.

stream of Buddhist culture; his fame did not go far beyond the immediate neighbourhood of Agni; that he was given the title of Bodhisattva is nothing but a piece of local patriotism¹.

¹ I regret to say that I cannot attach importance, for the study of the term *Twryr*, to the names of *Ttaugara* and *Ttaudāgar-* on which Professor Bailey puts such value. The former, Staël Holstein scroll 29, was explained as the name of a Turkish tribe, *Ttau(m)gara* = *Tongra*, in *BSOS.*, ix, 553-9. Professor Bailey, who at first accepted this explanation, has now (*Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1947, 148) returned to his earlier identification with *Θογάρα* and thinks that my opinion was based on two fallacious arguments: that tribes mentioned in the Khotanese scroll should be presumed to be of Turkish origin, and that all forms of the names extant in the 8th to 10th centuries in Kansu had already been documented. I did not make the second assumption, which, as far as I can see, forms no part of the argument I put forward; I am fully alive to the defectiveness of our material. As to the first assumption, it seems to me a reasonable one. If the date I suggested for the scroll (middle of the 9th century, *BSOS.*, ix, 559n.) is accepted—I do not think Professor Bailey disputes it—, it means that the scroll was written shortly after the great invasion of Kan-su by Uigur and other Turkish tribes in consequence of the destruction of the Uigur empire by the Qırqız. The authors of the scroll aim at giving a picture of the conditions that resulted from this invasion; their interest centres on these Turkish tribes whose mere names were new to their master in Khotan. However, while this assumption may be a reasonable one, my opinion was based not, or not chiefly, on it, but on the wording of the passage in the scroll. The text there says that the *Sikari*, *Ttaugara*, *Ayabiri*, *Caraihi*, *Yabüttikari*, etc., "are called Tarduš" (*BSOS.*, ix, 554; cf. Konow, *AO.*, xx, 138, 154). A previous list of tribal names ends with the words "these are Tölis". Both Tarduš and Tölis are well-known federations of Turkish tribes. The *Sikari*, *Ayabiri*, *Caraihi*, and *Yabüttikari* have been successfully identified as Turkish tribes (*BSOS.*, ix, 556-7). Should we not trust the authors of the scroll and accept their statement that the *Ttaugara*, too were a Tarduš, i.e., a Turkish, tribe? No explanation can be accepted which accounts neither for the final *-a* in *Ttaugara* (a stable *-a*, not a pl. ending), nor for the intervocalic *-g-* which here invariably indicates a palatal *g*, never a *γ*; unemended, *Ttaugara* represents **tögere* (**toyar* would be spelt **Ttau(h)ari*). The emended form, *Ttau(m)gara* fulfils all conditions.—As to *Ttaudāgar-* (attested is *ttaudāgarām*, gen. pl., P 2741, 78, see Bailey, *BSOAS.*, xii, 321, 323), I should hesitate to follow Professor Bailey in his identification of it with *Ttaugara*, from which it differs in two important points: 1. the insertion of *ā*, which is not found in any other Khotanese word so far made known, 2. the ending (*-gara* should have *-garatām* or *-garavām* in the gen. pl., cf. *śacūpatām* P 2741, 33, 64, *augavām* ibidem 66, and similar spellings). At first I thought to find here the 多覽葛 *To-lan-ko* (*Tū-lām-kāt*), an Uigur tribe, that could suitably be mentioned in a text as crowded with Turkish names as P 2741 undoubtedly is; but this would demand a minor concession (mis-spelling of **Ttaudamgarām*—the difference is very slight). On re-reading the passage, I see (taking into account Professor Bailey's discovery, kindly communicated by him, that *vi hā* = Skt. *ādi*) that it is not certain as yet that *Ttaudāgar-* is a tribal name ("two thousand troops came in front of the *Ttaudāgar-s* etc.", *pyamtsā* as postposition as in lines 17 and 129 in the same document); it may be the name of a locality.