Indiana University RAD

ILLiad TN: 904865

Journal Title: Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi

Volume:
Issue: 2005, 14
Month/Year: 2005
Pages: 5-20

Article Author: Beckwith

Article Title: On the Chinese names for Tibet, Tabghatch, and the Turks

Imprint:
http://www.indiana.edu/~ceus/faculty/bec

Call #: DF501 .A67 v.14 2005

Location: B-WELLS

Notes: if possible, please scan with OCR text recognition so I can search it later

Andrew Shimunek (ashimune)
Redbud 1402
2200 E. Lingelbach Ln
Bloomington, IN 47408

Notice: This material may be protected by US copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)

nd South East of
Dr. Dana Bădulescu,
: Romanian
blishing House,
eviewed by
..... 299

Turks, and
d. Brill's Inner
5. reviewed
..... 303

Sogdiens
es
..... 309

THE CHINESE NAMES OF THE TIBETANS, TABGHATCH, AND TURKS

CHRISTOPHER I. BECKWITH[1]

Perhaps the single most important historical event in East Asia in Late Antiquity was the migration of Mongolic-speaking peoples into the lands of the former Chinese empire in North China, parallel to the Germanic migration into the northern provinces of the Roman Empire. Chinese sources record the names of these and other peoples, but interpretation of the transcriptions remains problematic.[2]

T'u-fan 吐蕃 'Tibet'

The name 'Tibet' has long been known to be a foreign, non-Tibetan name for the country called by the Tibetans *Bod*, or *Bod-yul* 'Bod-land' (Beckwith 1977, 1987/1993). Many scholars nevertheless have pursued other ideas (e.g., Bazin and Hamilton 1991), especially the long seductive one that the name 'Tibet' reflects or includes the native Tibetan name *Bod* (Mair 1990).[3]

The medieval Chinese name of Tibet and the Tibetans, T'u-fan 吐蕃 NMan *tǔ-fān*, from MChi[4] *t^hɔpan* (Pul. 312, 89, *t^hɔ^2-puan^1*),[5] is explicitly said to be 語訛 'a

1 I am deeply indebted to Peter Golden for a stimulating e-mail discussion over several months and for a tremendous amount of help with bibliography and checking of works unavailable to me in Tokyo. I am also very grateful to Yutaka Yoshida for his generous assistance with Sogdian matters, and to Anya King, John Krueger, Victor Mair, and Jan Nattier for their help. I am of course responsible for all errors.

2 The approach followed by Bernhard Karlgren and his Chinese predecessors continues to dominate Chinese reconstruction, but in recent decades much has been learned about the phonology of Middle Chinese (Beckwith 2002a, 2004; Takata 1988) and to a lesser extent Old Chinese reconstruction too (Beckwith 2004b, forthcoming b).

3 He argues (V. Mair, p.c., 2005) that "the Mandarin term ought to be read as Tubo and that 'Tibet' ultimately means 'Upper Bod'." See notes 5 and 17.

4 I use an asterisk for all *reconstructed* Middle Chinese forms. For the theoretical forms reconstructed on the basis of the *fǎnqiè* spellings in the *Ch'ieh-yün* (or the Five Dynasties and Sung Dynasty rhyme tables, the sources for all published reconstructions of Middle Chinese), which usually are not provided with asterisks by Sinologists, though they should be (Beckwith 2002a), I use a small star (*). No sign is added for verbatim citations of attested forms, i.e., those recorded in Old Tibetan, Khotanese Brahmi, and other segmental scripts. In citations from Pulleyblank (1991) his tone marks are converted silently to numerals, and his *j* is converted to *y*.

5 The character 吐 is not attested in segmental transcription. The form given here represents the unvoiced reading of its attested homonym 土 (Tak. 310). The second character is also read *fán* from MChi *ban (Pul. 90 **buan^1*), though not in this name. On the modern reading of T'u-fan 吐蕃 NMan *tǔfān* as '*tǔbō*' see Pulleyblank (1991: 19-20); cf. Pelliot (1915), whose comments remain perceptive to this day. The reading appears to be due to corruption from transcriptions of the Mongol period or later.

linguistic mistake' (*CTS* 196a: 5219). The explanation given is essentially that the name T'u-fan 吐蕃 is a mistaken transcription of T'u-fa 禿髮 NMan *tūfá*, from MChi **t^{h}əwkpar* (Pul. 311, 89 **t^{h}əwk-puat*), which the Tibetans took as the name of their country from a historical leader of that Hsien-pei clan who settled in their territory. Another explanation given is that the Tibetans were descended from the Western Ch'iang, a branch of whom were the Fa Ch'iang 發羌; the pronunciation of *fā*, from Middle Chinese **par* (Tak. 372-373 *phar*;[6] Pul. 89 puat)[7] and *fān* was "close," so the Tibetans were called T'u-fan 吐蕃 (*HTS*: 216a: 6071).[8] These explanations appear to be due to external information. The Chinese historians must have learned that the Tibetan name of the country was *Bod* – though that too is not originally a 'Tibetan' name (Beckwith 1977) – while the international name was something like **Töpat* ~ **Töppat*. In view of the other transcriptions, Arabic تبت *tbt*, pointed and read in Classical pronunciation as تُبَّت *tubbat*, probably represents a foreign **tobbat* ~ **toppat* ~ **többat* ~ **töppat* (etc.);[9] Classical Arabic did not have the vowels *o* or *ö* or the consonant *p*. The idiosyncratic Old Turkic *twpwt* [töpöt] could perhaps represent an underlying foreign *[töpät].[10] The gemination of the labial is represented only by Arabic. It may be supported by or due to contamination with the Arabic name Tubba^c, with which the name of Tibet was usually etymologized (cf. Pelliot 1915: 20).

It is now known that final *n* in the rhyme to which 蕃 belongs – Starostin's (1989: 579) rhyme class 元D – was pronounced *r in 'Old Chinese' (Sta. 579 蕃 *par),[11] and long continued to be so pronounced in some dialects (Beckwith 2004: 99-102).

6 There is no phonemic distinction between unaspirated and aspirated unvoiced stops in Old Tibetan. In some texts the allophones are written incorrectly nearly as often as correctly (Beckwith forthcoming a).

7 This word always occurs with final *-d* [t] in the *A-mi-t'o ching*, the original text of which *sūtra* is unfortunately not reproduced in Takata (1988: 254-261). However, it is the only word that has this irregular pronunciation (the final non-nasal coronal in the rest of the text is *-r* as expected) and it always occurs in the same construction. The irregularity is clearly deliberate (probably ritualistic) and worth investigating.

8 Tu Yu (*TT* 190: 5170) more accurately says, "The origin of their nation is not known." The proposals of the Chinese historians have previously appeared to be irreconcilable with Chinese reconstructions, and have been ignored.

9 Cf. Pelliot (1915: 20). The somewhat late Greek form τουπατ- represents [tupat] ~ [tubat], but it is in any case clearly a loan from the Classical Arabic reading *tubbat*.

10 According to Old Turkic internal phonology, *töpüt* or *tüpüt* would be expected, but this is a foreign name and the runic script is ambiguous about the vowels *ü* and *ö*. Note the Middle and Classical Mongolian forms *töböd* and *töbed*.

11 There is partial external confirmation of the Old Chinese reconstruction, in that 安 NMan *ān* – which belongs to Starostin's (1989: 576-577) 元A rhyme class XXXV – was used to transcribe foreign *ar*, as in the first syllable of the name of the Arsacids. Though Starostin (1989: 578) reconstructs this as *?ān, as he himself shows through his listing of many 'inexact' rhymes among the different supposed subclasses, the latter were undoubtedly all the same basic rhyme if a unitary 'Old Chinese' is assumed. However, it is well known and accepted that dialect and period differences exist in the *Shih ching* poetry collection; a unitary reconstruction is by definition not rigorous. It is also true that

In the usual reconstructions of Midd
constructed as **t*. However, there is n
Middle Chinese, since there are many
scribed in Old Tibetan script, most dati
ries, in which *-r* regularly appears inste
poraneous transcriptions in other scripts
Arabic scripts, and loanwords into neig
Chinese final *r*.[12] In short, there is no
'standard' Middle Chinese during the
least from the last quarter of the sixth c
ever, on the basis of the early medieva
non-Chinese transcriptions) it is impos
coronal final was phonetically in the for
is also impossible to determine if the fi
words continues, in part, Old Chinese *
merger of Old Chinese final **r* and Old
firmly reconstructible for 'Old Chinese
spectively in standard Middle Chinese.

Reconsidering the Chinese words fo
dle Chinese, the 'correct' transcription
posed in the *Chiu T'ang shu* would hav
This is not 'close' to the Middle Chines
nor to the international pronunciation c
scholars knew about the archaic readin
quite different and would seem to be wh
'correct' transcription is further suppo
name of Tibet in the bilingual glossary
Pelliot tibétain 2762) in which the final

this final became *-n* very early in som
scribed in the second century B.C. as
where 山 NMan *shān* 'mountain', MC
sponds to *-san-* in 'Alek*san*dria'. The
not been explained. There is solid fore
name Ch'in – source of the name 'Chi
tion as σηρ- *sēr-*.

12 Virtually the only exceptions in atteste
which reflect final *-t*, indicating that the
eastern dialect that retained final *-t* or t
[t]. The latter is a good possibility cons
Japanese phoneme usually transcribed
the first time in the Sui and T'ang perio
non-nasal coronal syllable finals, inclu
scribed as a separate syllable instead. C

13 By 'standard Middle Chinese' is mea
Ch'ang-an (the capital) and the area of
rect contact with the non-Chinese peopl

In the usual reconstructions of Middle Chinese the non-nasal coronal final is reconstructed as **t*. However, there is no question but that it was *r* phonetically *in Middle Chinese*, since there are many long Chinese texts from Tun-huang transcribed in Old Tibetan script, most dating from the late 8th to the early 10th centuries, in which *-r* regularly appears instead of **-t*. There are also numerous contemporaneous transcriptions in other scripts, including Khotanese Brahmi, Uighur, and Arabic scripts, and loanwords into neighboring languages, which attest to Middle Chinese final *r*.[12] In short, there is no question but that there was no final **-t* in 'standard' Middle Chinese during the early medieval (Sui-T'ang) period, i.e., at least from the last quarter of the sixth century up to the early tenth century.[13] However, on the basis of the early medieval Chinese material alone (i.e., excluding all non-Chinese transcriptions) it is impossible to say what a given foreign non-nasal coronal final was phonetically in the foreign language transcribed by the Chinese. It is also impossible to determine if the final *r* of the Chinese transcriptions of foreign words continues, in part, Old Chinese **r*, if it is an innovation, or if it represents a merger of Old Chinese final **r* and Old Chinese final **t*, both of which phones are firmly reconstructible for 'Old Chinese' and have the regular reflexes *n* and *r* respectively in standard Middle Chinese.

Reconsidering the Chinese words for Tibet in light of what is known about Middle Chinese, the 'correct' transcription T'u-fa 禿髮 (Pul. 311, 89 **t^{h}əwkpuat*) proposed in the *Chiu T'ang shu* would have been pronounced in the T'ang **t^{h}əwkpar*. This is not 'close' to the Middle Chinese pronunciation of T'u-fan 吐蕃 as **t^{h}ɔpan*, nor to the international pronunciation of the name, **töpat*. Even if the post-T'ang scholars knew about the archaic reading of 蕃 as **par*, the first syllable (T'u-) is quite different and would seem to be what was meant by a 'linguistic mistake'. The 'correct' transcription is further supported by the 'unofficial' transcription of the name of Tibet in the bilingual glossary from Tun-huang (Pelliot 1961: 143-144, ms. Pelliot tibétain 2762) in which the final velar in the first syllable is attested, namely

this final became *-n* very early in some cases, because the name Alexandria was transcribed in the second century B.C. as 烏弋山離 Wu-i-shan-li (*HS* 96a: 3888-3889), where 山 NMan *shān* 'mountain', MChi *śan* (Tak. 366; Pul. 274 *ʂəin/ʂɛ:n), corresponds to *-san-* in 'Alek*san*dria'. The conflict between these two correspondences has not been explained. There is solid foreign transcriptional evidence for OChi **-r* in the name Ch'in – source of the name 'China' – which is earliest known in Greek transcription as σηρ- *sēr-*.

12 Virtually the only exceptions in attested material are the loanwords into Old Japanese, which reflect final *-t*, indicating that the loans either entered Japanese from a southern or eastern dialect that retained final *-t* or that the Japanese heard Middle Chinese final *-r* as [t]. The latter is a good possibility considering the unusual phonetic nature of the native Japanese phoneme usually transcribed as *r*. Foreign names transcribed into Chinese for the first time in the Sui and T'ang periods generally use final [r] to transcribe all foreign non-nasal coronal syllable finals, including *t*, *d*, *r*, and *l*, though often they are transcribed as a separate syllable instead. Cf. Note 7.

13 By 'standard Middle Chinese' is meant the prestige dialect, based on the dialect of Ch'ang-an (the capital) and the area of northwestern China in general – which was in direct contact with the non-Chinese peoples to the north and west.

T'e-fan 特蕃, in standard Middle Chinese pronunciation *dəkpan ~ *t^həkpan (Pul. 304, 89, 90 *dəkpuan; LMC *t^həkpuan), representing a transcriptional *təkpar or *takpar. Moreover, while the reconstruction of the Old Chinese final of 吐 NMan *tǔ*, which belongs to Starostin's (1989: 561-564) 魚 rhyme class XIII, is debated, it is agreed that it was, or contained at one point, a velar or laryngeal. In view of the attested alternate transcriptions of the name of Tibet, the first syllable final must have been a velar and in the archaic transcription dialect 吐 (OChi *t^hâɣ) must have been pronounced *t^hɔɣ ~ *t^həwɣ ~ *t^hâɣ,[14] so that 吐蕃 was actually read *t^hɔɣpar ~ *t^həwɣpar ~ *t^hâɣpar in that dialect[15] in the early seventh century. In any case it is clear that the dialect which recorded the transcription T'u-fan 吐蕃 retained Old Chinese readings of the rhymes of both characters. There are accordingly three different basic transcriptions of the name in Chinese, an Old Chinese-style one, 吐蕃 T'u-fan (*t^hɔɣpar ~ *t^həwɣpar ~ *t^hâɣpar); a Middle Chinese-style one, T'u-fa 禿髮 (*t^həwkpar); and a mixed one, T'eh-fan 特蕃 (*təkpar ~ *takpar). All of them transcribe the same *spoken Chinese* pronunciation of the same foreign name, but they do so using different values for the transcriptional characters.

In view of the unanimous non-Chinese transcriptions of the word-final consonant as *t*, the reconstruction of the underlying name – the foreign word the Chinese were trying to represent in their transcriptions – should have been *tâɣpat ~ *t^həwɣpat ~ *tɔɣpat,[16] though the syllables 發 NMan *fā* (MChi *par*) and 髮 NMan *fá* (MChi *par*) of the 'correct' transcriptions proposed by the post-T'ang historians belong to the same Old Chinese rhyme class, *-*uat*, which was actually the same as the rhyme class *uać (where *ć represents an Old Chinese affricate, [ts] or [ʧ]), as shown below.

According to the above analysis, the name T'u-fan 'Tibet' probably really is connected to the Hsien-pei name T'u-fa,[17] but because both are ultimately transcriptions of a dialect form, *t^hâɣpat, of the name T'o-pa. The name itself thus long predates its application to Tibet, with which place it originally had no connection.[18] It cannot be forgotten in this connection that T'o-pa was also the name of the most powerful clan of the Tang-hsiang (*TT* 190: 5169), the ancestors of the Tangut, who came from northeastern Tibet and moved into the area of Kan-su and Inner Mongolia during and after the Tibetan imperial period (Beckwith 1987/1993: 169-170, n. 174; Beckwith 1987b).

14 Starostin (1989: 563) reconstructs OChi *thāʔ. On Baxter's (1992: 793) *hlaʔ, his theory of reconstruction, and final *ʔ, see Beckwith (2002a, 2004b, forthcoming b).

15 In the standard dialect 吐蕃 was undoubtedly read *t^hɔpan (*t^hɔp^{ji}an) or the like, eventually becoming *t^hɔfan, and continued to be so pronounced thereafter.

16 Someone from the same dialect may have been responsible for the transcription of the name of the Jou-jan (which has several variants, including Juan-juan and Jui-jui) with what appears to be the same final *r*. The center of their kingdom was located directly to the north of Tun-huang and Chang-yeh (*TT* 196: 5378).

17 Similarly, "Peut-être après tout *Thuk-p^{w}'ad [Tu-fa], [*]Thu-p^{w}'an [T'u-fan], Tüpüt et Tibet ne sont-ils qu'autant de formes d'un même nom" (Pelliot 1915: 20).

18 T'u-fan first occurs in an entry for the year 634 (Beckwith 1987/1993: 21).

T'o-pa 拓

According to the attested Middle Chi
final *t as *r*, the name of the Mongolic
Northern Wei dynasty, T'o-pa 拓跋 N
Chinese reconstruction (Pul. 314, 27),
in Middle Chinese.[19] The Turks, who
North China', presumably got their fo
the Jou-jan (or Juan-juan, Jui-jui, who
or directly from the native T'o-pa pron
the like, as shown below. The metath
Turkic runic inscriptions.[20] The sixth c
of the name is ταυγάστ [taβγast] (Mora
which is accounted for by the fact that
in various ways in foreign names; the
derlying Turkic pronunciation *taβγač
to the existence of other Chinese transc
ing T'u-fa 禿髮[21] and the names of oth
ble must reflect an archaic dialect pron
it is clear that the Chinese transcriptior
pre-metathesized order of the intrasylla
form *Taβγač* has final *-č* ([tš], i.e., [ʧ]
fectly possible phonologically in Old
Chinese transcriptions (Old Turkic an
stop in this name.[22] The final *-č* is thus

If the final *-r* in the actual Middle
continuation of Old Chinese final *r*
pronunciation of the name might have

19 Ligeti (1970: 290) notes, "il y a lieu
recuillie par un texte chinois d'après la
(ou *taɣ-bar*) signifie «maitre de la terr
cette époque il existait réellement un t
Chinese pronunciation of 土 'earth, so
tested by the transcriptions *t^həwɣ ~ *t

20 There seem to be no examples of *-*γβ-*
does not discuss *-*βγ-* in *Taβγač* and
liot (1959, I: 217) inexplicably says th
Taβγač [...] most probably renders th
which founded [...] the dynasty of the

21 Ligeti (1970: 290 n. 45), citing Chir
Boodberg. The 'etymologies' are actua
archaic Chinese dialect pronunciation
pa that one was considered a form o
Hsien-pei clan names, it is difficult t
same name. Cf. the discussion of T'u-f

22 Cf. the Mongol form *tauɣaš* noted by L

ciation **dəkpan* ~ **t^{h}əkpan* (Pul.
iting a transcriptional **təkpar* or
e Old Chinese final of 吐 NMan
rhyme class XIII, is debated, it
velar or laryngeal. In view of the
ibet, the first syllable final must
lialect 吐 (OChi **t^{h}âγ*) must have
土蕃 was actually read **t^{h}ɔγpar* ~
seventh century. In any case it is
ption T'u-fan 吐蕃 retained Old
There are accordingly three dif-
an Old Chinese-style one, 吐蕃
liddle Chinese-style one, T'u-fa
(**təkpar* ~ **takpar*). All of them
of the same foreign name, but
nal characters.
iptions of the word-final conso-
e – the foreign word the Chinese
– should have been **tâγpat* ~
an *fā* (MChi **par*) and 髮 NMan
osed by the post-T'ang historians
, which was actually the same as
Chinese affricate, [ts] or [ʧ]), as

'u-fan 'Tibet' probably really is
use both are ultimately transcrip-
a. The name itself thus long pre-
originally had no connection.[18] It
was also the name of the most
the ancestors of the Tangut, who
rea of Kan-su and Inner Mongo-
eckwith 1987/1993: 169-170, n.

axter's (1992: 793) **hlaʔ*, his theory
2004b, forthcoming b).
t^{h}ɔpan (**t^{h}ɔp^{ii}an*) or the like, even-
ounced thereafter.
ponsible for the transcription of the
cluding Juan-juan and Jui-jui) with
eir kingdom was located directly to
'8).
], [*]Thu-p^w'an [T'u-fan], Tüpüt et
n" (Pelliot 1915: 20).
kwith 1987/1993: 21).

T'o-pa 拓跋 'Tabghatch'

According to the attested Middle Chinese pronunciation of inherited alveodental final *t as *r*, the name of the Mongolic-speaking Hsien-pei people who founded the Northern Wei dynasty, T'o-pa 拓跋 NMan *tuòbá*, or **t^{h}akbat* in theoretical Middle Chinese reconstruction (Pul. 314, 27), was actually pronounced *takbar ([t^{h}akbar]) in Middle Chinese.[19] The Turks, who pronounced it *Taβγač* 'Tabghatch, T'o-pa, North China', presumably got their form of the name either from their overlords, the Jou-jan (or Juan-juan, Jui-jui, who were evidently Mongolic speakers as well), or directly from the native T'o-pa pronunciation, which must have been **taγβač* or the like, as shown below. The metathesized form *Taβγač* is attested in the Old Turkic runic inscriptions.[20] The sixth century Greek transcription of the Turkic form of the name is ταυγάστ [taβγast] (Moravcsik 1958, II: 302-303), the final -στ [st] of which is accounted for by the fact that Greek had no affricates and represented them in various ways in foreign names; the transcription undoubtedly represents an underlying Turkic pronunciation **taβγač* [taβγatš] or possibly **taβγac* [taβγats]. Due to the existence of other Chinese transcriptions of this name or variants of it, including T'u-fa 禿髮[21] and the names of other Hsien-pei peoples in which the first syllable must reflect an archaic dialect pronunciation **t^{h}âγ-* or the like, as shown above, it is clear that the Chinese transcriptions (**-γb-* ~ **-gb-* ~ **-kp-* ~ etc.) represent the pre-metathesized order of the intrasyllabic phones **-βγ-*. But the attested Old Turkic form *Taβγač* has final *-č* ([tš], i.e., [ʧ]), not *-t*, or *-r*, both of which would be perfectly possible phonologically in Old Turkic. Neither of the early medieval non-Chinese transcriptions (Old Turkic and Greek) has a final liquid or simple dental stop in this name.[22] The final *-č* is thus significant.

If the final *-r* in the actual Middle Chinese reading of the name represented a continuation of Old Chinese final **r* rather than Old Chinese final **t*, the native pronunciation of the name might have been something like **takbar* as well. But the

19 Ligeti (1970: 290) notes, "il y a lieu d'admettre que l'étymologie sans doute populaire recuillie par un texte chinois d'après laquelle *t'o-pa*, ach. *t'âk-b'uât*, c'est-à-dire *taγ-bat* (ou *taγ-bar*) signifie «maitre de la terre, du sol» repose sur le fait que dans le sien-pi de cette époque il existait réellement un terme *taγ* signifiant «terre, sol». Note also the Old Chinese pronunciation of 土 'earth, soil', **t^{h}âγ*, and its archaic dialectal continuation attested by the transcriptions **t^{h}əwγ* ~ **t^{h}ək*, etc.

20 There seem to be no examples of **-γβ-* in Old Turkic; see Clauson (1962: 169-170), who does not discuss **-βγ-* in *Taβγač* and *Yaβγu*, both of which words he does mention. Pelliot (1959, I: 217) inexplicably says that the Chinese form is metathesized and "Tabγač, Taβγač [...] most probably renders the original form of the name of the Altaïc tribe which founded [...] the dynasty of the Northern Wei (386-556)."

21 Ligeti (1970: 290 n. 45), citing Chinese etymologies of the name T'o-pa quoted by Boodberg. The 'etymologies' are actually folk-etymologizing variant transcriptions. The archaic Chinese dialect pronunciation of T'u-fa was so close to the pronunciation of T'o-pa that one was considered a form of the other by the early Chinese. Since both are Hsien-pei clan names, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they were in fact the same name. Cf. the discussion of T'u-fan.

22 Cf. the Mongol form *tauγaš* noted by Ligeti (1970: 278 n. 24).

name was transcribed into Chinese early enough that it should not be reconstructed according to Middle Chinese values. Moreover, all sources confirm that the name of Tibet, which is in origin a form of the same Hsien-pei name, had final *-*t*, not *-*r*. The character 跋 NMan *bá* 'to trample' in the name T'o-pa 拓跋 NMan *tuòbá* is not attested in the *Shih ching* (Book of Odes) rhymes, but its character belongs either to Starostin's (1989: 574-575) Old Chinese rhyme class XXIX 祭A[23] *-*ać*, or to XXXII 月A *-*at*. He reconstructs the related characters 軷 and 拔 as **bh(ā)t* and **b(h)āć* respectively (Starostin 1989: 575).[24] According to Starostin, this is a netohnyj ('inaccurate, inexact') rhyme, but these putatively distinctive *Shih ching* rhymes actually freely rhyme with each other, and in fact, both rhyme classes include more attested 'inaccurate' rhymes than 'accurate' ones, and each occurs equally often in rhymes with the other class; similarly, other syllables with the same final *-*ć* interrhyme with syllables reconstructed with final *-*t* (Starostin 1989: 570-576). A clear example of this is *Shih ching* Ode 16, in which there could only have been one rhyme, though Starostin and Baxter have reconstructed three rhymes, one with final *-*t* and two with final *-*ć* (or *-*ts*),[25] evidently based on the traditional rhyme categories (Legge 1966: 26-27).[26] This is clearly a very old error. Its significance for the Ode in question – and for the *Shih ching* rhymes as a whole, or 'late' Middle Old Chinese – is that there is no reconstructible phonemic difference between the codas *-*t* and *-*ć* (or *-*ts*). In short, 跋 NMan *bá* in the name T'o-pa 拓跋 could have been pronounced either **bat* or **bać* in an archaic Chinese dialect; it is impossible to decide on the basis of the Chinese alone. Similarly, the character 髮 NMan *fǎ* 'hair', representing MChi **par* (Tak. 372-373 *phar*) in the Hsien-pei ethnonym T'u-fa 禿髮 (Pul. 311, 89 *t^{h}əwk-puat*), also belongs to this rhyme, and could be reconstructed for Old Chinese as **pat* ~ **pać*. The Old Turkic affricate (along with its Greek version) suggests that the final consonant was the affricate.

The Chinese sources relate that the T'o-pa themselves say the name T'o-pa means 土后 'ruler of the earth'. The account in the *Wei shu* (1: 1),[27] after recounting

23 Rhyme *classes* are often referred to rather than specific rhymes of specific attested characters because in many cases a particular character is not attested in a *Shih ching* rhyme and it is then necessary to use a phonetically related character. Naturally, the resulting uncertainty causes major differences among reconstructions.

24 Cf. Karlgren (1957: 87); Baxter (1992: 746) reconstructs 軷 **bat* and 拔 **bɔts*.

25 The two rhymes with final *-*ć* are reconstructed with different vowels, *-*a* and *-*o*. But this is problematic. It is certain that the vowel *-*o* split and became *-*wa* in most cases very early in Old Chinese (Beckwith forthcoming b). Since the first set of rhymes has the vowel *-*a* as well, the supposed distinction among them in Ode 16 disappears.

26 In Middle Chinese there is no distinction between the two categories, despite some reconstructions. The Tun-huang texts regularly have *-ar*, although the rhymes involved are spread over several categories in the *Ch'ieh-yün* (Lung 1968), each including examples from the series built on the phonetic 犮 (Karlgren 1957: 87, phonetic 276a), including 髮 *fá* (rhyme 月9; Tak. 372: *phar*), 跋 *bá* (rhyme 末11; Tak. 364 **bar*), and 拔 *bá* (rhyme 黠12; Tak. 366 *par*, *phar*). For 跋 **bar*, the attested spellings are *bad* and *ba*. They may reflect ritual pronunciation; cf. note 7.

27 It is unclear why Tu Yu (*TT* 196: 5373) has altered this to read: "Some say that they are the distant descendants of the Yellow Emperor. Because the earth of the Yellow Em-

the legend that the Hsien-pei were *Huang ti*), says:

> The Yellow Emperor ruled by th
> 土 (NMan *tǔ*) 'earth' 拓 **t^{h}ak* an
> so they took [**t^{h}akbać*] (i.e., T'o-

While there is no way to know if 'ru
ogy of the name **Taγβač*, it is unqu
knew the T'o-pa language) thought i
likelihood that the pieces of the wor
T'o-pa said they had. Based on the f
of Old Turkic *taβγač*, and on the reco
including T'u-fan 'Tibet' (q.v. above)
pa form **taɣ-*. Ligeti notes that the
correctly with a word in the T'o-pa
'earth' in Mongolic (Ligeti 1970: 2
dialect of Hsien-pei, belongs, as de
magisterial article.[29] Accordingly, the
lable, based on the Chinese transcript
**bać*, 髮 NMan *fǎ* from **pat* ~ **pać*
among others, and on the premetath
should be **bat* ~ **pać* ~ *βač* (~ etc.)
is no known Mongolic word with a si

In the century and a half precedin
lectually conquered by Buddhism, a r
loan words and calques (literal transl
into Chinese. The expression 'lord o
in Buddhist texts (Wogihara 1986:
pati[30] 'lord, ruler', usually translated
scriptions reconstructed as **bat* ~ **p*
rit form of the Sanskrit word *pati*.[31]

peror is virtuous, and they call 土 'e
ingly they took [**t^{h}akbać*] as their cl

28 For an explanation of the ideology re

29 The doubts that have been expressed
works, notably Pelliot's, on whose ac

30 From Indo-Iranian **pati* 'id.', from
kins 2000: 69; cf. Adams 1999: 278)
gesting I look into Iranian *pati* 'mast
tify the T'o-pa word.

31 Words with initial *p* in Sanskrit very
rits and their Chinese loanforms. "Il
pas au sanscrit, mais à un de ces prâ

the legend that the Hsien-pei were descendants of the Yellow Emperor (黃帝 *Huang ti*), says:

> The Yellow Emperor ruled by the power of Earth;[28] in the North they call 土 (NMan *tǔ*) 'earth' 拓 **t^{h}ak* and they call 后 (NMan *hòu*) 'ruler' 跋 **bać*, so they took [**t^{h}akbać*] (i.e., T'o-pa) as their clan-name.

While there is no way to know if 'ruler(s) of the earth' is indeed the actual etymology of the name **Taγβač*, it is unquestionable that the T'o-pa (or at least an who knew the T'o-pa language) thought it was and so explained it. There is thus some likelihood that the pieces of the word did have the meanings the Chinese say the T'o-pa said they had. Based on the form **taγ* in the premetathesized form **taγβač* of Old Turkic *taβγač*, and on the reconstruction of other Chinese forms of the name, including T'u-fan 'Tibet' (q.v. above), T'o- 拓 MChi **t^{h}ak-* should represent a T'o-pa form **taγ-*. Ligeti notes that the Chinese did indeed identify the first syllable correctly with a word in the T'o-pa language since there is a word **taγ* meaning 'earth' in Mongolic (Ligeti 1970: 289-290), to which language family T'o-pa, a dialect of Hsien-pei, belongs, as demonstrated conclusively by him in the same magisterial article.[29] Accordingly, the second syllable should be right too. That syllable, based on the Chinese transcriptions 跋, i.e., NMan *bá* from theoretical **bat ~ *bać*, 髮 NMan *fǎ* from **pat ~ *pać* (in T'u-fa), and 發 NMan *fā* from **pat ~ pać*, among others, and on the premetathesized form of the Old Turkic transcription, should be **bat ~ *pać ~ βač* (~ etc.) 'ruler, lord' in the T'o-pa language. But there is no known Mongolic word with a similar form and meaning.

In the century and a half preceding the T'o-pa conquest, North China was intellectually conquered by Buddhism, a religion originating in India. Hundreds of Indic loan words and calques (literal translations of foreign expressions) were introduced into Chinese. The expression 'lord of the earth', meaning 'sovereign', well known in Buddhist texts (Wogihara 1986: 728, Skt *viṣayapati*), contains the Indic word *pati*[30] 'lord, ruler', usually translated as 主 NMan *zhǔ* 'ruler'. The Chinese transcriptions reconstructed as **bat ~ *pat* are fairly accurate representations of a Prakrit form of the Sanskrit word *pati*.[31] Assuming this is the origin of the second sylla-

peror is virtuous, and they call 土 'earth' 拓 **t^{h}ak*, and 后 'ruler, lord' 跋 **bač*, accordingly they took [**t^{h}akbać*] as their clan-name."

28 For an explanation of the ideology referred to see Wang (2000: 138 et seq.).

29 The doubts that have been expressed by some since are based on the quotation of earlier works, notably Pelliot's, on whose actual views see Ligeti (1970: 277).

30 From Indo-Iranian **pati* 'id.', from Proto-Indo-European **poti* 'powerful, lord' (Watkins 2000: 69; cf. Adams 1999: 278). I am indebted to Peter Golden (p.c., 2005) for suggesting I look into Iranian *pati* 'master' and its Indic cognate *pati* in my attempt to identify the T'o-pa word.

31 Words with initial *p* in Sanskrit very often have voiced initials in the Central Asian Prakrits and their Chinese loanforms. "Il se peut très bien que les emprunts aïent été faits non pas au sanscrit, mais à un de ces prâcrits si copieusement sonorisés dont les inscriptions

ble of T'o-pa would give the name the theoretical underlying pronunciations *ta*ɣ*bat* and *ta*ɣ*pat*, the latter being in fact the reconstruction of its form in the name T'u-fan 'Tibet' (q.v. above).[32] In the T'o-pa name borrowed into Old Turkic it was **βač* (or *vač* ~ *wač*) and in the Chinese transcription T'o-pa it is **bać* ~ **bat*.

The attested final *č* of the Old Turkic form is not problematic, as it is the regular Mongolic development of **t* when followed by **i*. This change would have been normal for T'o-pa, a Mongolic language, and probably for Jou-jan, which seems to have been a dialect of it. The continuant initial **β* is not directly reflected in any of the Chinese transcriptions of the name T'o-pa or its variants T'u-fa, T'u-fan, etc. While the T'o-pa form of the word is ultimately from a Central Asian Prakrit form of Indic *pati* 'ruler', Indo-Buddhist terms were largely first introduced to China by Central Asians who used not Sanskrit but Prakrits (cf. Coblin 1983), in which initial *p-* is often voiced (Pelliot 1915). In Gāndhārī Prakrit the reflex of *pati* sometimes appears as *vati*, and indeed the word is most commonly transcribed in the early (third century CE) Chinese Buddhist text translations as 越 NMan *yuê*[33] (cf. Soothill and Hodous 1937/2003, s.v. 檀越 'donor', corresponding to Skt *dānapati*)—theoretical Middle Chinese **wat* (*CY* 5: rhyme 9 月; Pul. 388 **wuat*) from Late Old Chinese **wat* ~ **wać*. In view of the Turkic transcription (**βač*), the Chinese transcription in the name T'o-pa (**bat* ~ **bać*), and the Chinese loanform **wat* ~ **wać* of this word, it appears that the Hsien-pei Mongolic speakers borrowed the word from foreign Buddhists who used the Prakrit pronunciation *vati*, giving the early T'o-pa Mongolic form **βač*, which was transmitted eventually to the Turks as **βač*. Because the early Chinese Buddhists had already borrowed a form of the word *pati*, Prakrit *vati*, as **wat* ~ **wać* before the rise of the T'o-pa, 跋 **bat* ~ **bać* in the name T'o-pa should represent the T'o-pa pronunciation of the loanword **βač* ~ **vać* ~ **bać* 'ruler'.

The name T'o-pa thus refers at once to both the Chinese Yellow Emperor and an Indo-Buddhist world ruler, and in both traditions, not only to the element Earth and the color Yellow but to the Center, the direction of rule.[34] It is not surprising that a people attempting to establish their rule over a vast realm would have carefully chosen a royal clan name that literally means 'Rulers of the Earth'.

de l'Inde, les manuscrits d'Asie centrale et les transcriptions chinoises archaïques nous attestent l'ancienne expansion" (Pelliot 1915: 25 n. 2).

32 This suggests a local Kansu-Kokonor area pronunciation of *pati* as **pat*. The later Chinese transcriptions (such as 波提 MChi **patey*) have initial **p-*.

33 Jan Nattier, p.c., 2005. I am of course fully responsible for any errors.

34 The Indo-Buddhist system of five elements varies somewhat from the Chinese one, and many of the correlations are different, but they agree on Earth being yellow and square and in the center (Soothill and Hodous 1937/2003, s.v. 土, 地, and 五).

T'u-chi

The Chinese transcription of the name Middle Chinese **turkwar* ~ **durkwar* 372 *kwar*)[36] has long been problemat going back ultimately to Marquart (I **Türküt*, though it has since been argu a Mongol plural suffix but from a hy matta 1972), a Sogdian *-t* plural form many hundreds of contemporaneous e in Greek, Arabic, Tibetan, and many like *Türküt or *Turkît in any langua 突厥, meaning 'Turk', is first record two decades before the appearance o ravcsik 1958, II: 320-321), followed Tibetan transcriptions. The first sylla The remainder of the syllable written taken into consideration.

Firstly, because theoretical Middl nounced *r*, the transcription T'u-chü read **turkwar*.[39] Transcriptions in nc root *türk*.[40] The second syllable vowe scriptions is clearly an internal Tibe

35 Pulleyblank (1991: 311) says, "The *Guangyun* with radical 40 instead o character." In fact, both the **t*^{h}- and 5: rhyme 10沒: 他骨反 and 陁忽反;

36 The *Ch'ieh-yün* gives both unaspirate rhyme 9月).

37 Bailey (1982: 85) comments on Ha name of the Turks from the Sogdian would be rather *-êt*) as a Sogdian pl Sogdian plural of a stem in *-aka-*, wh dian *-yy*, *-y* (that is, *-ê*, later *-î*, from v

38 The one putative example in Sogdi (1965) argues that the two characters *türk*.

39 This does not mean that the object of

40 Clauson (1962: 84-89) argues that th second syllable stem vowel *-ü- cou Turkic spellings, which is ambiguous *türk* also occurs in the very same text proven the rest of Clauson's theory.

41 Bailey (1982: 84) notes that *ttûrka-* " "elsewhere always *ttrûka-*." I am gra (1962: 86) adds the Khotanese spell form was *ttūrk-* or *ttrūk-*, and that th

tical underlying pronunciations
econstruction of its form in the
ame borrowed into Old Turkic it
ption T'o-pa it is *bać ~ *bat.
ıt problematic, as it is the regular
'. This change would have been
ably for Jou-jan, which seems to
is not directly reflected in any of
its variants T'u-fa, T'u-fan, etc.
om a Central Asian Prakrit form
gely first introduced to China by
cf. Coblin 1983), in which initial
crit the reflex of *pati* sometimes
nmonly transcribed in the early
ıs as 越 NMan *yuè*[33] (cf. Soothill
responding to Skt *dānapati*)—
; Pul. 388 **wuat*) from Late Old
ription (**βač*), the Chinese tran-
Chinese loanform **wat ~ *wać*
lic speakers borrowed the word
ıunciation *vati*, giving the early
tted eventually to the Turks as
ılready borrowed a form of the
ise of the T'o-pa, 跋 **bat ~ *bać*
nunciation of the loanword **βač*

Chinese Yellow Emperor and an
ot only to the element Earth and
rule.[34] It is not surprising that a
realm would have carefully cho-
'the Earth'.

scriptions chinoises archaïques nous
).
ation of *pati* as **pat*. The later Chi-
initial **p-*.
ıle for any errors.
ɔmewhat from the Chinese one, and
e on Earth being yellow and square
.v. 土, 地, and 五).

T'u-chüeh 突厥 'Turk'

The Chinese transcription of the name of the Turks, *T'u-chüeh* 突厥 NMan *tūjué*, in Middle Chinese **turkwar ~ *durkwar* (Pul. 168, 311 *t^{h}wətkuat ~ dwətkuat*;[35] Tak. 372 *kwar*)[36] has long been problematic. The now traditional explanation of Pelliot, going back ultimately to Marquart (Harmatta 1972: 263-264), is that it represents **Türküt*, though it has since been argued that it derives not from Turkic directly via a Mongol plural suffix but from a hypothetical Sogdian **twrkyt*, i.e., **turkît* (Harmatta 1972), a Sogdian *-t* plural form of *twrk* 'Turk'.[37] Yet despite the existence of many hundreds of contemporaneous early medieval transcriptions of the name *Türk* in Greek, Arabic, Tibetan, and many other languages, there are no transcriptions like *Türküt or *Turkît in any language, including Sogdian.[38] The name T'u-chüeh 突厥, meaning 'Turk', is first recorded in an account dated to 545 A.D., less than two decades before the appearance of the Greek transcription Τουρκ- [turk-] (Moravcsik 1958, II: 320-321), followed about a century later by the Arabic and Old Tibetan transcriptions. The first syllable of the underlying name *Türk* is thus clear. The remainder of the syllable written with 厥 is the problem. Several facts must be taken into consideration.

Firstly, because theoretical Middle Chinese syllable-final **t* was actually pronounced *r*, the transcription T'u-chüeh in that period in the standard dialect was read **turkwar*.[39] Transcriptions in non-Chinese writing systems represent only the root *türk*.[40] The second syllable vowel in the Old Tibetan and Old Khotanese transcriptions is clearly an internal Tibetan or Khotanese development.[41] Except for

35 Pulleyblank (1991: 311) says, "The modern reading may be for E. t^{h}wət, written in the *Guangyun* with radical 40 instead of 116 but given in the *Jiyun* as a reading for this character." In fact, both the *t^h- and *d- readings of 突 are given in the *Ch'ieh-yün* (*CY* 5: rhyme 10沒: 他骨反 and 陁忽反; cf. Kar. 134 **t'uət- ~ *d'uət-*.

36 The *Ch'ieh-yün* gives both unaspirated and aspirated initial pronunciations for 厥 (*CY* 5: rhyme 9月).

37 Bailey (1982: 85) comments on Harmatta's theory, "the Chinese may have learnt the name of the Turks from the Sogdians and hence the name may have been **turkît* (this would be rather *-êt*) as a Sogdian plural. But this *-ît* (rather *-êt*) can only be the later Sogdian plural of a stem in *-aka-*, which is in older Sogdian *-k*, but in Manichean Sogdian *-yy*, *-y* (that is, *-ê*, later *-î*, from which *-aka-tâ-* gave *-êtâ-*."

38 The one putative example in Sogdian script does not exist; see below. Pulleyblank (1965) argues that the two characters of *T'u-chüeh* are a unitary transcription of the word *türk*.

39 This does not mean that the object of the transcription was so pronounced.

40 Clauson (1962: 84-89) argues that the original form of the name was *türkü* because a second syllable stem vowel *-ü- could theoretically be attested in one of the two Old Turkic spellings, which is ambiguous on this point. However, the unambiguous spelling *türk* also occurs in the very same texts, as he himself shows. Pulleyblank (1965) has disproven the rest of Clauson's theory.

41 Bailey (1982: 84) notes that *ttûrka-* 'Turk' occurs only once in Old Khotanese texts, and "elsewhere always *ttrûka-*." I am grateful to Peter Golden for this reference. Clauson (1962: 86) adds the Khotanese spellings *ttūrki*, *ttrūki*. The variants show that the base form was *ttūrk-* or *ttrūk-*, and that there are no forms with final *-u*. The second Tibetan

Chinese, then, there is no second syllable in any early transcription of the name *Türk* from anywhere, including the earliest clear examples – Greek Τουρκ- [turk], Arabic *twrk-* [turk], and Old Tibetan *drug-* [druk] ~ [drük].

Secondly, the one putative textual attestation of the theoretical underlying Sogdian plural form **Turkīt* (Harmatta 1972: 273) cannot be a form of the word *türk* at all, not to speak of a plural form of it. The exception is said to occur in the first line of the Sogdian inscription from Bugut, dated to the late sixth century A.D., which is a funerary inscription for Tatpar (formerly read 'Taspar') Qaghan erected by his son and successor (Yoshida and Moriyasu 1999).[42]

In the first line of the inscription the clearly written letters *tr'wkt* occur. They have been read as the Sogdian *-t* plural of *Türk* by Kljaštornyj and Livšic (1972: 85, 87-88; 1978: 54) and Yoshida (p.c., 2005). These editions interpret *tr'wkt* as a metathesized form [truk] of the regular Sogdian spelling *twrk* [turk] 'Turk'.

Yoshida (p.c., 2005; Yoshida and Moriyasu 1999: 123) reads and translates Line 1 of the Bugut Inscription as follows:

rty mwn'k nwm snk' 'wst't δ'r'nt tr'wkt "šyn's kwtr'tt 'xšywn'k

'Kings of the Turkish Ashinas clan have established this stone of the (Buddhist) law.'

He notes (Yoshida, p.c., 2005) that there is a similar phrase in the Sogdian face of the Karabalgasun Inscription; he reads and translates the sentence in which it occurs as:[43]

vowel thus did not come from Khotanese. The Tibetan base form is probably *drug*, which usually occurs only in compounds. It has been extended within Tibetan by the addition of the diminutive noun suffix form *-u* (after *g*; as in *myugu* 'grain sprout', *smyugu* 'pen', *lugu* 'lamb'), perhaps to help distinguish it from *drug* 'six'. The name is used in the *Old Tibetan Annals* exclusively to refer to the 'Western' Turks (Beckwith 1987/1993: 63-64, n. 56).

42 I am deeply indebted to Yutaka Yoshida for generously answering my many questions about this inscription and other Sogdian issues. I would especially like to thank him for sending me photocopies of his and Moriyasu's article and of his photographs of the rubbings, as well as a copy of the handout from his 2003 lecture at the Collège de France giving parallel quotations of his and Kljaštornyj and Livšic's editions and translations. Without his help I would not have been able to discuss this problem in any detail. I should note that he does not agree with me on several important points, and I am of course responsible for any errors that might remain.

43 Y. Yoshida, p.c., 2005. He notes further that *kwtr'tt* "is a plural form of *kwtr*, loanword from Sanskrit *gotra*, and *knty* is an original Sogdian word. Although there is a difference in the word order of Turk and Ashinas-clan, I do not think it significant. Incidentally, the passage in KB [the Karabalgasun Inscription] describes the event in which Uighurs, conspiring with Basmils and Qarluqs, conquered the second Tujue empire and there is practically no doubt as to what the expression refers to." Yoshida's edition of the Bugut Inscription also eliminates the putative occurrence of *βγβwmyn* or *βγγ βwmyn* proposed by Kljaštornyj and Livšic (1978: 54), who interpret it as "Bumyn [= Bumïn]" Qaghan. There is no *-βwm-* in the text, as far as can be seen on the photocopy of the rubbing. Yo-

''šn's knty twrk 'xš'wnδ'r "st'nt

'They took the ruler of the Tujue

The string *tr'wkt* in the Bugut Inscri word or two words, *tr* and *'wkt*, as t the *aleph* (') – as noted in the altern 1999)[45] – if not three words or morpl *trwkc* in the second line according translated as "Turkish" in their rende ing to the palaeographic forms of th in the text. It may be thought that the seem to be assured by the immediate shida reads as *'(')šy-n's* 'Ashinas'. *c(yn)st'n* 'China'. In fact, the rubbing what this particular string really re well. The putative *Ashinas readin wholly – dependent on the interpreta tion. Yet this interpretation is extrem

The word *twrk* 'Turk' is unamb texts:[47]

1. a contract for the sale of a fe 'Turkistan' is described as he
2. the Karabalgasun Inscription 'Turks' occur;

shida reads it as *wmn'*, 'Umna' (Q 'Bumin' with an initial **t*, 土門 T'u scription, dated to 545, is two centu the name, *Bumïn*, but only a few d also other considerations, but unfor lem further.

44 Translating this completely into En 'They took the ruler of the Turks o published translation of the Bugut I have established [this] stone of law

45 He considers that *tr* and *'wkt* coul 2005).

46 Yoshida and Moriyasu (1999) read dered as "Muqan Qaghan's Yaruka *'wrkwp'r*, read as "Urkupar" (in a Magha [...]"). What is interesting agrees with the exceptionless Sogdi the sequence *tr'wk-* in the preceding

47 I owe this information to Y. Yoshi errors.

''šn's knty twrk 'xš'wnδ'r ''st'nt

'They took the ruler of the Tujue [= T'u-chüeh] of the Ashinas clan.'[44]

The string *tr'wkt* in the Bugut Inscription is clearly written, and could be either one word or two words, *tr* and *'wkt*, as there is a slight space between the *resh* (*r*) and the *aleph* (') – as noted in the alternate transcripton *tr-'wkt* (Yoshida and Moriyasu 1999)[45] – if not three words or morphemes, such as *tr*, *'w*, and *kt*. The putative word *trwkc* in the second line according to Kljaštornyj and Livšic (1972: 85; 1978) is translated as "Turkish" in their rendering. However, the first letter is not a *t* according to the palaeographic forms of the Bugut Inscription,[46] so there is no such word in the text. It may be thought that the reading of *tr'wkt* as *Turkit in line one would seem to be assured by the immediately following string in the same line, which Yoshida reads as *'(')šy-n's* 'Ashinas'. However, Kljaštornyj and Livšic read it as *c(yn)st'n* 'China'. In fact, the rubbing is unclear right at that point and it is uncertain what this particular string really represents; other readings could be proposed as well. The putative *Ashinas reading in both inscriptions is itself partly – if not wholly – dependent on the interpretation of *tr'wkt* as *Turkit in the Bugut Inscription. Yet this interpretation is extremely problematic at best.

The word *twrk* 'Turk' is unambiguously attested in Sogdian in the following texts:[47]

1. a contract for the sale of a female slave dated to 639 A.D., where *twrkstn* 'Turkistan' is described as her place of origin;
2. the Karabalgasun Inscription, where the words *twrkc'ny* 'Turkish' and *twrk* 'Turks' occur;

shida reads it as *wmn'*, 'Umna' (Qaghan). Also, the Chinese texts transcribe the name 'Bumin' with an initial **t*, 土門 T'u-men, i.e., *Tumïn (*CS* 50: 908). The Chinese transcription, dated to 545, is two centuries earlier than the Old Turkic inscriptional form of the name, *Bumïn*, but only a few decades earlier than the Bugut Inscription. There are also other considerations, but unfortunately there is no space here to discuss this problem further.

44 Translating this completely into English, it would mean, according to his interpretation, 'They took the ruler of the Turks of the Ashinas clan.' His and Moriyasu's (1999: 123) published translation of the Bugut Inscription reads, "Kings of the Turkish Ashinas tribe have established [this] stone of law [...]."

45 He considers that *tr* and *'wkt* could not be two independent words (Y. Yoshida, p.c., 2005).

46 Yoshida and Moriyasu (1999) read it as *y'rwk'* Yaruka (which occurs in a phrase rendered as "Muqan Qaghan's Yaruka-brother"). In the second line there is also a string *'wrkwp'r*, read as "Urkupar" (in a phrase rendered as "for the sake of Urkupar Cracu Magha [...]"). What is interesting about this word is the sequence *wrk* [urk], which agrees with the exceptionless Sogdian spelling of the name of the Turks, *twrk*, not with the sequence *tr'wk-* in the preceding line.

47 I owe this information to Y. Yoshida (p.c., 2005). I am of course responsible for any errors.

3. the Mt. Mugh documents (early 8th century), where the personal name *twrk* 'Turk' occurs;
4. the *Mahrnāmag* (early 9th century), where the personal name *twrk* 'Turk' occurs;

In all of these Sogdian texts the word 'Turk' is spelled *twrk*. The Bugut Inscription, with the putative example *tr'wk-*, would be the only occurrence of such a spelling of 'Turk' in Sogdian. This very same problematic example also provides the lone attestation of a putative plural form *tr'wkt* 'Turks'. Yet *twrk* in the Karabalgasun Inscription actually has plural meaning, 'the Turks', although it is singular in form. The unquestionably attested form *twrk* 'Turk' is thus not formally pluralized in Sogdian even in the one undoubted instance when it is plural.[48] In fact, ethnonyms are rarely, if ever, pluralized in any of the contemporaneous non-Indo-European Asian languages in which the name 'Turk' occurs, even when pluralization is an option, as in Arabic.[49] In addition, the Chinese transcription T'u-chüeh, which is ultimately the motivation for this reading, could never have been read **turkīt*, since a foreign syllable **kīt* could not have been transcribed by 厥 MChi *kwar*, theoretical MChi **kwat* (Pul. 168).[50] The only possible conclusion is that whatever the Bugut Inscription string *tr'wkt* represents it is not **turkīt* ~ **turkit* 'Turks'. The meaning of Sogdian *tr'wkt* in the Bugut Inscription is unknown, and no form **Turkut* ~ **Turkīt* ~ **Turkit* exists in that language.[51]

48 As in other Indo-European languages, ethnonyms are sometimes formally pluralized in Sogdian (Y.Yoshida, p.c., 2005). There are to my knowledge no examples of **Türklär* 'Turks' in the Orkhon inscriptions or in other Old Turkic texts, and needless to say, the hypothetical form **Türküt* does not occur there either. Peter Golden (p.c., 2005), notes similarly, "I cannot recall ever seeing Türkler in an Old or Middle Turkic text. The same is true for other ethnonyms (e.g. Qarluq, Türgesh et al.)." The word *Türk* 'Turk' is thus never pluralized in Old Turkic. The situation is similar in other non-Indo-European Asian languages.

49 In Arabic the word *al-Turk* 'the Turk; Turk; Turks; the Turks' is generally used as a collective or non-specific plural, e.g., in the frequent expression *bilād al-turk* 'land of the Turks'. When early Arab writers wished to refer to a plurality of Turkic nations or tribes, they would sometimes use *al-Atrāk* 'the Turks; Turks', though even in such cases *al-Turk* is more frequently used, as in the title of Maḥmūd al-Kāshghārī's famous book, *Dīwān lughāt al-Turk* 'Account of the Languages of the Turks'. In short, the word *al-Turk* is grammatically singular, but as it is semantically non-distinctive for plural marking it can be used to represent singular, collective, or plural number. The same appears to be true for Sogdian.

50 Harmatta (1972) argues that 厥 can transcribe **kit* because it belongs to the same rhyme as 月, and the Turkic name Ch'u-yüeh 處月 MChi **čü^{ij}guar* transcribes **čigil*. This is not correct. The second syllable of the Chinese could hardly transcribe **gil* (or **git*). However, Ch'u-yüeh could perhaps represent a foreign **čügül*.

51 The immediately following string in the Bugut Inscription is read by Kljaštornyj and Livšic (1972: 85) as *c(yn)st'n* 'China' and by Yoshida and Moriyasu (1999) as *'(')šy-n's* 'Ashinas', but it is partly damaged and unclear; the reading of the same name in the Karabalgasun Inscription is also uncertain. In view of the nonexistence of the word 'Turk' in the extant text of the Bugut Inscription, Yoshida and Moriyasu's translation,

Thirdly, the second syllable in T'
ond syllable of the name of the T'o-
Taβγač,[52] representing metathesized
sents a close transcription of two syll
lable **wać* is identical to the second
[taγβatš], namely **βač*, which also o
**T^{h}akbać*, in which the second syll
'ruler'. The syllable **wać* in the nar
Turkic transcription **βač* (*wač* ~ *vać*
Indic *vati* ~ *pati* 'ruler', then a well-k
resonance[53] that had been transmitte
fore the rise of the T'o-pa. It occur
many solidly attested examples in E
development of the affricate final *č*
dently transcribed as an affricate by

"Kings of the Turkish Ashinas tribe
vised.

52 Clauson (1972: 438) remarks, "Tavğ
khanid royal titles."

53 The Jou-jan and early Türk were als
fluence. Several rulers had Indic na
man', a paternal relative of the last J
active in the 520s (*TT* 196: 5381).
Muqan Qaghan's third successor 攝
sources and transcribed as 'Išbara'
K'o-han 莫何始波羅 (*TT* 197: 540
has previously been identified as a l
identify where or by whom the iden
sents theoretical MChi *ma-γa, the
Brahmi are unanimous in transcribin
tle, since Maheśvara (from *mahā* 'g
title of Śiva, 'king of the gods', and
(cf. *mahīśvara*, with *mahī* 'earth, la
eign of the nation'). One of the mo
"great sovereign ruler," is T'ien W
1937/2003). With the native Türk re
fication of their paramount ruler as
like (a title formally taken by the T
the last qaghan of the First Turkic
Turkic qaghan cannot be accidenta
borrowed by the Türk differ from th
īśvara is transcribed *inter alia* as
though (as in the present cases) the
study of the transcriptions is needed.

54 The Chinese transcription, considere
final. Three reflexes of *pati* – **wač*,
Eurasian-North Chinese milieu, thou
Chinese reading **turkwat* would be
fricate provided by the Old Turkic a
precisely the sequence of borrowing

Thirdly, the second syllable in T'u-chüeh belongs to the same rhyme as the second syllable of the name of the T'o-pa, which is transcribed in Old Turkic form as *Taβγač*,[52] representing metathesized **Taγβač*. The Chinese name T'u-chüeh represents a close transcription of two syllables: **turk* 'Türk' plus **wać*. The second syllable **wać* is identical to the second part of the compound name T'o-pa, **Taγβač* [taγβatš], namely **βač*, which also occurs in the Chinese transcription of the name, **T^{h}akbać*, in which the second syllable **bać* is explicitly glossed in Chinese as 'ruler'. The syllable **wać* in the name T'u-chüeh is thus identifiable with the Old Turkic transcription **βač* (*wač* ~ *vač*) of the T'o-pa word **βač* 'ruler', a loan from Indic *vati* ~ *pati* 'ruler', then a well-known international culture word with powerful resonance[53] that had been transmitted by Buddhist missionaries to China long before the rise of the T'o-pa. It occurs independently as 越 **wat* ~ **wać* 'ruler' in many solidly attested examples in Buddhist texts from the third century on. The development of the affricate final *č* ~ **ć*, explainable within Mongolic, was evidently transcribed as an affricate by both the Turks and the Chinese.[54] The first

"Kings of the Turkish Ashinas tribe have established [this] stone of law," should be revised.

52 Clauson (1972: 438) remarks, "Tavğaç [i.e., Taβγač] was a frequent component in Karakhanid royal titles."

53 The Jou-jan and early Türk were also under very heavy Indo-Buddhist and Chinese influence. Several rulers had Indic names or titles, including P'o-lo-men 婆羅門 'Brahman', a paternal relative of the last Jou-jan ruler, A-na-kuei 阿那瓌 *Anakwai Qaghan, active in the 520s (*TT* 196: 5381). A well-known Indic-titled ruler among the Türk is Muqan Qaghan's third successor 攝圖 She-t'u, usually called Sha-po-lüeh 沙鉢略 in the sources and transcribed as 'Išbara' or 'Ishbara' by scholars, namely Mo-ho Shih-po-lo K'o-han 莫何始波羅 (*TT* 197: 5404) *ma-ha-śi-par-la, 'Maheśvara' Qaghan. 'Išbara' has previously been identified as a loan from Sanskrit *īśvara*, but I have not been able to identify where or by whom the identification has been made. While Mo-ho 莫何 represents theoretical MChi *ma-γa, the many attested forms in both Tibetan and Khotanese Brahmi are unanimous in transcribing 何 as *ha* (Tak. 304-305). This is undoubtedly a title, since Maheśvara (from *mahā* 'great' + *īśvara* 'sovereign') means 'great king'; it is a title of Śiva, 'king of the gods', and is also equated with Brahmā, 'the Lord of the world' (cf. *mahīśvara*, with *mahī* 'earth, land, country', meaning 'Lord of the earth' or 'Sovereign of the nation'). One of the most common designations of Śiva, or Maheśvara, the "great sovereign ruler," is T'ien Wang 天王 'King of Heaven' (Soothill and Hodous 1937/2003). With the native Türk religion centered on *Tängri* 'Heaven' and their identification of their paramount ruler as *Tängri Qaghan* – i.e. the 'King of Heaven' – or the like (a title formally taken by the T'ang ruler T'ai-tsung after his defeat and capture of the last qaghan of the First Turkic Empire), the choice of *maheśvara* for the title of a Turkic qaghan cannot be accidental. The transcriptions of this and other Indic words borrowed by the Türk differ from the usual Chinese Buddhist transcriptions where, e.g., *īśvara* is transcribed *inter alia* as 伊葉波羅 *i-śiap-pa-la and 伊濕伐羅 *i-śip-par-la, though (as in the present cases) they are usually still recognizable. A careful, detailed study of the transcriptions is needed.

54 The Chinese transcription, considered purely internally, is ambiguous with respect to the final. Three reflexes of *pati* – **wač*, **bat* ~ **bać*, and **pat* – are attested in the Central Eurasian-North Chinese milieu, though perhaps not in the same areas, so an underlying Chinese reading **turkwat* would be possible if it were not for the confirmation of the affricate provided by the Old Turkic and Greek transcriptions. In order to determine more precisely the sequence of borrowing – and in particular, the development of the 'west-

embassy to the Türk was sent in 545, when the T'o-pa were still ruling large parts of North China. Use of a T'o-pa word for 'ruler' would make sense in a diplomatic situation where people would have been speaking T'o-pa or Jou-jan.

T'u-chüeh 突厥 is thus a clear transcription of a foreign **türk-wač*, a compound consisting of the name *Türk* plus the word **βač* 'ruler, lord'. It means 'Rulers of the Türk' or 'the Türk Rulers'.[55]

References

Bailey, Harold W. 1982. *The Culture of the Sakas in Ancient Iranian Khotan.* Delmar, NY: Caravan Books.

Baxter, William 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Reconstruction.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (= Bax.)

Bazin, Louis and James Hamilton 1991. L'origine du nom Tibet. *In*: Ernst Steinkellner, ed., *Tibetan History and Language: Studies Dedicated to Uray Geza on his Seventieth Birthday* (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 26). Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, 9-28.

Beckwith, Christopher I. 1977. A Study of the Early Medieval Chinese, Latin, and Tibetan Historical Sources on Pre-Imperial Tibet. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.

— 1987. *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia: A History of the Struggle for Great Power among Tibetans, Turks, Arabs, and Chinese during the Early Middle Ages.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. Revised paperback edition 1993.

— 1987b. The Tibetan Empire in the Ordos and North China: Considerations on the Role of the Tibetan Empire in World History. *In*: C.I. Beckwith, ed., *Silver on Lapis*. Bloomington: Tibet Society, 3-11.

— 2002a. The Sino-Tibetan Problem. *In*: Christopher I. Beckwith, ed., *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002, 113-157.

— 2002b, review of Laurent Sagart, *The Roots of Old Chinese* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999). *Anthropological Linguistics,* 44.2: 207-215.

— 2004a. *Koguryo, the Language of Japan's Continental Relatives: An*

ern' names with **pat*, T'u-fa and T'u-fan – it would be necessary to establish the chronology and areal location of Chinese transcriptions of different forms of the word *pati* 'ruler'.

55 The exact parallelism between the names **taγ-wač* 'T'o-pa', **taγ-pat* 'Tibet', etc., which mean 'Rulers of the Earth', and **türk-wač* 'Rulers of the Türk' (or 'Türk Rulers'), and the somewhat similar phonetic shape of the first syllables, might suggest the possibility that the word *türk*, the etymology of which is unknown, could also mean 'Earth' in its original language. All these names would then mean the same thing, 'Rulers of the Earth'. Cf. Pelliot's remark in note 17.

Introduction to the Historical-Compa
Languages, with a Preliminary Desc
Chinese. Leiden: Brill.

— 2004b. Old Chinese. *In*: P. Strazny, e
2. London: Routledge, 771-774.

— forthcoming a. The Sonority Sequen
Margins.

— forthcoming b. Old Tibetan and the D

Clauson, Sir Gerard 1962. *Turkish and M*
Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

— 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary o*
Clarendon Press.

Coblin, W. South 1983. *A handbook of*
Chinese University Press.

Harmatta, J. 1972. Irano-Turcica. *AOH*

Karlgren, Bernhard (1957). *Grammata S*
Eastern Antiquities. Reprinted 1972.

Kljaštornyj, S.G. and V.A. Livšic 1972.
AOH 36: 69-102.

— 1978. Otkrytie i izučenie drevnetjurk
pamjatnikov Central'noi Azii. *In* A.P
Etnografija Mongolii. Novosibirsk: N

James Legge 1966. *The Chinese Classic*
minor text corrections and a Table of
hsing shu-chü.

Ligeti, Louis 1970. Le Tabghatch, un dia
ed., *Mongolian Studies*. Amsterdam:

Ling-hu, Teh-fen 1971. 周書 *Chou shu.*

Liu, Hsü 1975. 舊唐書 *Chiu T'ang shu.*

Lung, Yü-ch'un 1968. *T'ang hsieh ch'üa*
Ch'ieh-yün chiao-chien. Hong Kong

Mair, Victor H. 1990. Tufan and Tulufan
for Tibet and Turfan. *Central and In*

Moravcsik, Gyula 1958. *Byzantinoturcic*
Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Pan, Ku and Pan, Chao 1962. 漢書 *Han*

Pelliot, Paul 1915. Quelques transcriptio
16: 1-26.

— 1959-1973. *Notes on Marco Polo*. Pa

— 1961. *Histoire ancienne du Tibet*. Pa

Pulleyblank, E. G. 1965. The Chinese N

— 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pro*

'o-pa were still ruling large parts
would make sense in a diplomatic
T'o-pa or Jou-jan.
a foreign **türk-wač*, a compound
uler, lord'. It means 'Rulers of the

in Ancient Iranian Khotan.

e Reconstruction. Berlin: Mouton

du nom Tibet. *In*: Ernst
e: Studies Dedicated to Uray
dien zur Tibetologie und
Tibetische und Buddhistische

y Medieval Chinese, Latin, and
et. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana

History of the Struggle for Great
nese during the Early
ress. Revised paperback edition

lorth China: Considerations on
y. *In*: C.I. Beckwith, ed., *Silver*

her I. Beckwith, ed., *Medieval*
2002, 113-157.
Old Chinese (Amsterdam: John
, 44.2: 207-215.
tinental Relatives: An

ld be necessary to establish the chro-
s of different forms of the word *pati*

vač 'T'o-pa', **tay-pat* 'Tibet', etc.,
Rulers of the Türk' (or 'Türk Rulers'),
st syllables, might suggest the possi-
unknown, could also mean 'Earth' in
mean the same thing, 'Rulers of the

Introduction to the Historical-Comparative Study of the Japanese-Koguryoic Languages, with a Preliminary Description of Archaic Northeastern Middle Chinese. Leiden: Brill.

— 2004b. Old Chinese. *In*: P. Strazny, ed., *Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, Vol. 2. London: Routledge, 771-774.

— forthcoming a. The Sonority Sequencing Principle and Old Tibetan Syllable Margins.

— forthcoming b. Old Tibetan and the Dialects and Periodization of Old Chinese.

Clauson, Sir Gerard 1962. *Turkish and Mongolian Studies*. London: Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

— 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coblin, W. South 1983. *A handbook of Eastern Han sound glosses*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Harmatta, J. 1972. Irano-Turcica. *AOH* 25: 263-273.

Karlgren, Bernhard (1957). *Grammata Serica Recensa*. Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities. Reprinted 1972.

Kljaštornyj, S.G. and V.A. Livšic 1972. The Sogdian Inscription of Bugut Revised. *AOH* 36: 69-102.

— 1978. Otkrytie i izučenie drevnetjurkskix i sogdijskix epigrafičeskix pamjatnikov Central'noi Azii. *In* A.P. Okladnikov, ed., *Arxeologija i Etnografija Mongolii*. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 37-60.

James Legge 1966. *The Chinese Classics. IV. The She King*. ("Second edition with minor text corrections and a Table of Concordances.") Reprinted Taipei: Wen-hsing shu-chü.

Ligeti, Louis 1970. Le Tabghatch, un dialecte de la langue Sien-pi. *In*: Louis Ligeti, ed., *Mongolian Studies*. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner, 265-308.

Ling-hu, Teh-fen 1971. 周書 *Chou shu*. Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü. (= *CS*)

Liu, Hsü 1975. 舊唐書 *Chiu T'ang shu*. Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü. (= *CTS*)

Lung, Yü-ch'un 1968. *T'ang hsieh ch'üan-pen Wang Jen-hsü k'an-miu pu-ch'üeh Ch'ieh-yün chiao-chien*. Hong Kong: Chung-wen ta-hsüeh. (= *CY*)

Mair, Victor H. 1990. Tufan and Tulufan: The Origins of the Old Chinese Names for Tibet and Turfan. *Central and Inner Asian Studies* 4: 14-70.

Moravcsik, Gyula 1958. *Byzantinoturcica*. Zweite durchgearbeitete Auflage, 2 vols. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Pan, Ku and Pan, Chao 1962. 漢書 *Han shu*. Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü. (= *HS*)

Pelliot, Paul 1915. Quelques transcriptions chinoises de noms tibétains. *T'oung pao* 16: 1-26.

— 1959-1973. *Notes on Marco Polo*. Paris : Imprimerie Nationale.

— 1961. *Histoire ancienne du Tibet*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Pulleyblank, E. G. 1965. The Chinese Name for the Turks. *JAOS* 85: 121-125.

— 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late*

Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin. Vancouver: UBC Press. (= Pul.)
Soothill, William Edward and Lewis Hodous 1937/2003. *A dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms, with Sanskrit and English equivalents and a Sanskrit-Pali index.* London: Kegan Paul, 1937. Internet ed. by Charles Muller, Tokyo <http://www.hm.tyg.jp/~acmuller/soothill/soothill-hodous.html> 2003.
Startostin, S. A. 1989. *Rekonstrukcija drevnekitajskoj fonologičeskoj sistemy.* Moscow: Nauka. (= Sta.)
Sung, Ch'i and Ou-yang, Hsiu 1975. 新唐書 *Hsin T'ang shu.* Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü. (= *HTS*)
Takata, Tokio 1988. 敦煌資料による中國語史の研究 (Tonkō shiryō ni yoru Chūgoku-goshi no kenkyū). *A historical study of the Chinese language based on Dunhuang materials: the Hexi* (河西) *dialect of the ninth and tenth centuries.* Tokyo: Sobunsha. (= Tak.)
Tu, Yu 1988. 通典 *T'ung tien.* Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü. (= *TT*)
Wei, Shou 1974. 魏書 *Wei shu.* Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü. (= *WS*)
Wogihara, U., ed. 1986. 漢訳対照梵和大辞典 (Kanyaku taishō Bon-Wa daijiten), revised edition. Tokyo: Kodansha.
Yoshida, Yutaka and Takao Moriyasu 1999. ブグト碑文 Bugut Inscription. *In*: T. Moriyasu and A. Ochir, eds., モンゴル国現存遺蹟・碑文調査研究報告 (Mongorukoku genson iseki · hibun chōsa kenkyū hōkoku) *Provisional Report of Researches on Historical Sites and Inscriptions in Mongolia from 1996 to 1998.* Osaka: The Society of Central Eurasian Studies, 122-125.

THE PLACE OF RUS'

CHARLE

In order to understand fully the intera principalities and city-states, and the called it) successor state of the Mongo until 1480,[3] it is first of all necessary t studies of Rus'-Tatar relations often fai on the Golden Horde.[4] This essay drav Golden Horde on the basis of a new, o nature of the Golden Horde. It then s sources did not manifest this concepti of that omission for modern Russian hi

1 This article was inspired by my partic the Golden Horde and Its Successors i Ayza-Tahir Turkistan Idil-Ural Found writing the Conference. I also wish Tuna for his curiosity and patience dur my ideas.
2 The anachronistic term *Zlataia /Zolot* contemporary Rus' sources usually ref origin of the term "Golden Horde" is it, and will not place it in quotation m taste. Donald Ostrowski has strong ob chak Khanate." In Donald Ostrowski, tutions," *Slavic Review* 49:4 (Winter, "contemporary," a claim not repeated *Influences on the Steppe Frontier,* where he states that the Horde called i "court." I do not find the term "Kipch ously in my opinion since the Kipchal the pre-Mongol Kipchaks as khans, so pre-Mongol Kipchak chieftainships. T and retained a separate social identity fifteenth century. The Horde occupied not geographic term, so "Kipchak Kh equivalent term might be the awkward ate" (a term which was occasionally Chagatayid Khanate, the Horde might Thus there are several potential repla have no objections, but "Kipchak Khar
3 The date "1480" is arbitrary, and acq end of Mongol rule only in the mid *Yoke* (Columbus, OH, 1985), pp. 150-
4 Charles J. Halperin, "Omissions of N Golden Horde as Politics of Inclusion