THE NAME OF THE "TOKHARIAN" LANGUAGE

by W. B. HENNING

Two words have been regarded as names of the old language of QaraShahr ("I A"), which is almost universally called "Tokharian" now. One, dārī, 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 dārī refers to I A at all and insist that it is a foreign word, a Prakrit of Skt. ārya-, so that "ārī language" should mean āryabhāsā = Sanskrit. The other, tnvṛ, 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 tnvṛ by the Uigurs was the language now named "Tokharian"; in his view, tnvṛ meant an Iranian dialect, probably Khotanese Saka. It is proposed here to re-examine the colophons in which tnvṛ is mentioned, without entering into the problem of dārī for the present.

In an article published ten years ago, I endeavoured to settle the limits of the area in which the tnvṛ language was spoken by having recourse to a geographical or political term, the "Four-Tnvṛ-Land", occurring in Sogdian, Uigur, and Middle Persian sources contemporary with the Uigur colophons. It became clear that this "Four-Tnvṛ-Land", presumably the home-land of the tnvṛ language, lay in Chinese Turkestan, and probably that it lay "near or between Bisbaliq and Kus" (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 Karabal-gasan, 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 this monument?

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

no confusion, (ii) the second consonant in Tnvṛ, which was probably pronounced Twar, was voiced (ɣ). 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 reign speculative. That the Twar language was mis-named Tokharian was due to such confusion; the identification, across seven or eight hundred years and five hundred miles or more, of Twar with the name of the Θώγουρος¹ 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-Tnvṛ-Land" is mentioned seemed to provide any decisive argument either way (even though the weight of evidence favoured the view that Tnvṛ = 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 sqq. The view now held by Professor Bailey (Trans. Philol. Soc., 1947, 152 sqq.) approximates to it,—As Ṭdvādr = Sogdian 𐭍kwā (štaw), the initial of Θγύρους, Θγύρους 〚βος,  Θγύρα 〛, should appear as S 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 unctious Yu-chi/Θγύρους would appear to have founded in Eastern Balochistan: Parthian Twar i.e. Twarān in the inscription of Shapur I. (line 2), beside Tvarst i.e. Tvarstān (instead of Tvarstān?), = Tvarṣi = MPers. Tvarṣ, Tvarst i.e. Tvarstān (line 19 = MPers. line 24; also in Pers. I 3 where twart instead of Twarst; Man. Parth. Turān-lah, Armenian Turan, Arabic Tiran). MPers. Tur- is regularly developed from Tvar- (by *Tawr-, cf. mura from mury, etc.).

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

⁴ The point was made in a paper I read to the American Oriental Society at the meeting in New York in April 1946.
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 "rahu Kusān" (Oktu Küsän) into the Twory language, and from that into Turkish. In view of the geographical position of the region in which those languages were spoken (Kūčār : 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 dialect.

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

Nahridīš utāra toymiṣ Aryačinti bodisvā kī ārā
Anīkák tiilīn(in) Tov̲r̲i tili(ne) yaratmī
Ił-baligda toymiṣ Pratyanakṣitā kī ārā
Tov̲r̲i tiilīn Türk tili(ne) avirmī
Maitreya-samiti nom biṭī

"The sacred book Maitreya-samiti, which the Bodhisattva guru ācārya Āryacandra, who was born in the country of Nagaradāsa, had composed in the Twory language of the Indian language, and which the guru ācārya Prajārakṣita, who was born in Ibalīq, translated from the Twory language into the Turkish language."

The mistake is in the first word, N"kṛyūṣ. The letters 3 (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 3. Further, while Kn, K̲r̲ can often be confused, the three groups are neatly distinct in this manuscript (cf. Kn in ykrmv line 2; K̲r̲ in ynkrmv lines 1 and 2, 'mnK̲r̲ line 5): here the group is KN. The correct reading of the name of Āryacandra’s birth-

place, therefore, is "kṛyūṣ.

1 Provided that "rahu Kusān had the same value as the simple Kusān. Identity of "rahu with the Tibetan O-then was suggested long ago (cf. BSOS, ix, 590). I should hesitate to follow Professor Bailey in his proposal to compare "rahu further with Chinese HSH and HSH - bok (Trans. Philol. Soc., 1947, 147). The only sound that is common to "rahu and bok is the K. For a Kuchean word underlying bok we should expect *p̲q̲ or *p̲q̲ in Uigur. Chin. bok is a monosyllable with consonantal initial: Uig. bok is a disyllabic with vocalic initial.

2 We know now that translations were made from Kuchean into Sogdian, see my Sogdica, 39 sqq. Moreover, a fragment of the Sogdian version of this particular book could recently be identified. Its title in Sogdian was b3 p2r̲k̲h "The ten good deities". The fragment ("Γ" i a"), which is from the pnymys prnv "fifth chāna", contains part of the story of King Kātanaśvara (anāna in Sogdian). See Müller, Uigurica, iii, 27 sqq.; L. J. Schmidt, 3Dawans-Bulan oder Der Weise und der Thor, ch. 1, transl. 4-7.

The name of the "Tokharian" language

It is obvious that "kṛyūṣ is Aṃgīdēsa "the land of Agni" = Qarašahr; the form Aṃgīdēsa was not hitherto attested, but the equivalent Āmjiṣaya occurs, see Lüders, Weitere Beiträge. Sh. P.A.W. 1930, 29 line 5. Agni is the sanskritized form of the name which originally was Ṙṛg, later shortened to Ṙṛg. Thus Āryacandra, who composed the Maitreysamiti in the Twory language, was a native of Qarašahr, where I A is the current language.

This clinches the argument: according to the colophons to the I A version of the Maitreysamiti Āryacandra composed that work: according to the Uigur colophons Āryacandra composed that work in the Twory language: Āryacandra’s mother tongue was I A; hence I A is Twory. 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 Twory to some other language; their mainstay was the argumentum e silen·to that there might have been in existence a third version of the Maitreysamiti.

At the same time we can now finally dispose of the name "Tokharian". This manner has been supported by three reasons, all of them still discredited. Firstly: the vague resemblance of Twory to the name of To-khāristan; it would be waste of time to discuss this any further. Secondly: the proximity, in the colophons, of Kusān to Twory, Kusān having been identified with Küsän since Hanae’s much-cited article we know that Kusān was the Turkish name of Küsän. Thirdly: the presumed fact that Āryacandra was a native of Nagarā = 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 Maitreysamiti, a unique 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 Niyā documents, Khotanese Sakas, Manchurian Middle Persian and Sogdian, Persian geographers, and let us add, Chinese historians: for that Yen-ch’i transcribes Argh (or *Argh) is plain (see BSOS, ix, 571). As far as I know, there is no warrant for *Argh (Bailey loc. cit. 127). All other spellings derive from the sanskritized Aṃga; so also Kuchean abhiśa in which I now see an adaptation of agnī, a(g)hīe in the Muraq 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 patriotism.\footnote{I regret to say that I cannot attach importance, for the study of the term Taqwa, to the names of Taugara and Taqadgar- on which Professor Bailey puts such value. The former, Stael Holstein scroll 29, was explained as the name of a Turkish tribe, Taqadgar = Tongara, 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 Göydm 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 do 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., 553n.) 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 Turks. 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, Taugara, Aysahri, Caruhsi, Yubatihali, etc., "are called Tadrah" (BSOS., ix., 554; cf. Konow, AO., xvi, 138, 154). A previous list of tribal names ends with the words "these are Tolas": Both Tadrah and Tolas are well-known federations of Turkish tribes. The Sikari, Aysahri, Caruksi, and Yubatihali have been successfully identified as Turkish tribes (BSOS., ix., 555-7). Should we not trust the authors of the scroll and accept their statement that the Taugara, too, were a Tadrah, i.e., a Turkish tribe? No explanation can be accepted which accounts neither for the final -u in Taugara (a stable -u, not a pl. ending), nor for the intervocalic -g- which here invariably indicates a palatal -g- never a -y-. Unamed, Taugara represents *Taugara (*Taoura would be spelt *Touhali). The emended form Taugara fulfils all conditions. As to Taqadgar- (attested is Taqadgaran, gen. pl., P 2741, 78, see Bailey, BSOS., xi, 321, 323), I should hesitate to follow Professor Bailey in his identification of it with Taugara, from which it differs in two important points: 1. the insertion of -a, which is not found in any other Khotanese word so far made known, 2. the ending -gar, -gar should have -garo in the gen. pl. cf. \text{a} Tadrah, 66, and similar spellings). At first I thought to find here the \text{a} Ta-lan-ha (Tad-lam-ha?); 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 *Taqadgara—\text{a}—the difference is very slight). On re-reading the passage, I see (taking into account Professor Bailey's discovery, kindly communicated by him, that \text{a} Ta-lan-ha does not certain as yet that Taqadgar- is a tribal name ("two thousand troops came in front of the Taqadgar-a etc."); pyramtad as postposition as in lines 17 and 129 in the same document) it may be the name of a locality,