

The Tibetan names of the Saka and the Sogdians

Autor(en): **Hoffmann, Helmut H.R.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **25 (1971)**

Heft 1-4

PDF erstellt am: **25.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146292>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

THE TIBETAN NAMES OF THE SAKA AND THE SOGDIANS

HELMUT H. R. HOFFMANN

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Dedicated to the memory of my
revered teacher Hans Heinrich
Schaefer

I

One of the most crucial problems for the historian of ancient Tibet is the identification of the names of foreign countries and peoples. As it is the case with other Central Asian peoples some countries or tribes will be characterized by different names; a new tribe occupying the area of an older one may sometimes adopt the name of his predecessor, and in other cases a people transplants its name to a very distant region of the continent. An especially intricate problem faces us, if we try to make out the different meanings of the Tibetan ethnic term 'Sog' through the ages.

There is certainly no doubt about the basic meaning of that name in later times when it had to serve as one of the designations of the Mongols along with 'Hor' (a word which also has a long and entangled history) and even the synonym compound 'Hor-sog'. In this case we need not to adduce references because we may feel on firm soil. Furthermore we are entitled to neglect the Sog tribes of rGya-sde between the Tengri Noor of gNam-mc^o p^cyug-mo and Č^cab-mdo¹, because these tribes are of Tibetan stock.¹

But there is sufficient evidence from older times viz. since the T'ang early years of the Mongol empire. This passage is to be found in the Bu-

1. Cp. R. A. Stein: *Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet*, Paris 1959, p. 100 n. 6 (when dealing with the sTod-gliñ and the sMad-gliñ of the Sog in the Gesar epic); 'Sog désigne des nomades établis au Tibet'. It is quite unsure whether this meaning can be claimed already for the T'ang period.

slob-rnams-la sprin-ba 'The Message to his Disciples' by Sa-skya period which coincides with the time of the vast Tibetan empire and its great Emperors. At that time, it is true, Sog should mean something different. There exists even an interesting passage dating back to the Pañdi-ta Kun-dga' rgyal-mc'an (1182-1251) when returning 1247 from his meeting with the Mongolian prince Godan². Here we read:

yu gur gyi rgyal k'ams 'di yañ ma brlag pa'i goñ p'an du mi nor
rnams k'on gis blañs nas / yig mk'an / nor gñer ba / bu dga' t'ams
čad k'on gis byed / rgya / mi ñag / sog po sogs (6) pa ma brlag goñ du
hor la dpya btañ yañ či zer ma ñan pas / brlag pa'i rtiñ la 'gro sa ma rñed
nas no blta dgos byuñ /

'Before the kingdom of the Uighurs had been destroyed he (the Great Qaghan) took away the property of men and used to appoint secretaries, treasurers, and bu-dga' (strong guards?)³ of his own. Before he had destroyed China⁴, Si-hia⁵, and Sog-po etc., although (these kingdoms) had to pay tribute to the Mongols they did not obey the

2. This text is now of easy access because 'The Complete Works of the Great Masters of the Sa-skya Sect of Tibetan Buddhism' (Sa-skya-pa'i bka'-bum) have been published by the Toyo Bunko, Tokyo 1968. For our text see Vol. 5, p. 401 (na, fol. 215b, line 5f.). Cp. also G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, Roma 1949, p. 10.

3. This term would mean in Tibetan 'glad son' which makes no sense here. Perhaps it is a Mongolin loan word but I am not certain about a reasonable equivalent. Buqa 'bull' which occurs in many names mentioned in the 'Secret History' (P. Poucha: 'Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen', *Archiv Orientalní, Supplementa IV*, Praha 1956, pp. 53, 91, 105, 108, 118, 153) seems to be out of question, and so is böge 'shaman'. So one might think of identifying bu-dga' with böke 'wrestler, athlete, strong man'. It does not seem unlikely that the Great Qaghan sent together with his secretaries and treasurers a guard of strong men. But, of course, this is a weak argument because we do not find the böke mentioned in Mongolian texts serving on that purpose.

4. i. e. the Chin Empire of Altan Qan.

5. cp. R. A. Stein, 'Mi-ñag et Si-hia', *BEFEO XLIV* (1951), pp. 226/27: 'il est compréhensible qu'on parle de Mi-ñag dans le Nord, du côté de Kan-tcheou, à l'époque du royaume Si-hia'; L. C., p. 226, n. 5: 'Il semble que les auteurs tardifs aient adopté une formule toute faite, combinant les éléments Mi-ñag, Byañ-nos et Gha/Ga', pour désigner les territoires semi-tibétains du nord-ouest de la Chine.' Si-hia became tributary to Činggis Qaghan after the campaign of 1211/13 and was subjugated definitely only in 1225/26 (cp. Poucha, *CAJ* 1 (1955), p. 284.

words he said, and when they had been defeated and did not find a place to go they were compelled to submit.'

It should be stated that in this whole letter only Hor^{5a}, in earlier times the Tibetan equivalent of the Uighurs, is used for 'Mongols', and it is strictly distinguished from Sog-po (the name Sog with the Tibetan noun-former -po) which in our passage may only mean the people of the west viz. the Muslim kingdom of the Khwārezm Shāh, called Sartaqčīn or Sarta' ul in the 'Secret History'⁶. Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta alludes here to the campaign of Činggis Qaghan in 1219⁷ which ended in a crushing defeat of the Khwārezm Shāh. The data of Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta are of unique importance, because his letter can be dated quite exactly. Two very clear instances which show that Sog-po means 'Muslim' have recently been published by me: one from Bu-ston's commentary on the translation of Kālacakra I, 152 and the other one from the Č^cos-'byuñ of dPa'-bo gcug-lag 'p^creñ-ba^{7a}:

1. ma k'a'i (ste sog po) yul gyi bā ga da. 'Baghdād in the Mecca country (i.e. Sog-po = Muslim country).'
2. k'yad par du sog po' i yul tri ti čes pa groñ bye ba yod par bā gada'i groñ du sbrañ rci' i blo gros byuñ. 'Particularly there appeared Mohammed in the city of Baghdād in the Tri-ti country, a land of the Sog-po (Muslims).'

But we have to mention furthermore the frequent references to the ethnic name Sog-po meaning 'Muslims' even in later works written by Tibetan historians. I give a quotation from the dPag-bsam ljon-bzañ of Sum-pa mk'an-po (completed A.D. 1749) where the author⁸ deals with 'the Muslim country in the western direction of India called

5a. cp. infra note 36.

6. cp. Haenisch's Glossary s.v.

7. P. Poucha: 'Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen', p. 190.

7a. *CAJ XIII*, p. 56 and 66. Bu-ston's comment is given in brackets. For further information the reader may rely on the article just cited.

8. Dpag bsam ljon bzang of Sum pa mkhan po. *A History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, ed. by Sarat Chandra Das, Part I, p. 40, line 3.

Delhi' (rgya gar nub p'yogs di li žes pa'i sog yul). From that example we can gather that Sog-po has been used in later times as a name of the Mongols as well as for Muslims⁹.

II

It is now necessary to go back to the period of the great Tibetan empire, a time, when most of foreign people's names were adopted. In this connection I have to mention first an entry in the old annals from Tun-huang, published and translated by Professor Bacot¹⁰. Here mention is made of an important event of the year 694, viz. the capture of a Tibetan high official who belonged to the famous mGar family which provided the Tibetan empire with many ministers and generals. The text runs in the following way: mgar stagu sog dagis bzuñ, what only may mean 'mGar Stagu was captured by the Sog'. But Bacot gives the version: 'Mgar Sta-gu fut pris par les Mongols', adding the following note: 'Le nom des Mongols peut sembler prématuré pour l'époque. Mais le tibétain sog ne peut designer ici qu'une des peuplades qui formeront plus tard l'ensemble mongol.' This seems to me, it is true, a very weak argument. Already Professor F.W.Thomas who contributed to Bacot's book the edition and translation of a small fragment of the annals preserved at London which covers the years 743-763 A.D. was at odds with Bacot's view, and he found in his text two entries dealing with 'Brog-sog, 'Sog of the upper pasture lands' (line 5 and 11 of his scroll): 1. ru bži 'brog sog mk'os bgyis 'The inspection of the Sog of the upper

9. Sog-po is only one of those ethnic names of originally different meaning which later were transferred to the Muslims as it was the case with the Gar-log (originally the Turkish Qarluq), the Ta-zig (a name derived from the Arabian tribe of Taiy but used later for the Muslims of Persia and other countries to the west of Tibet), Turuška (originally the Sanskrit name of the Turks) and kLa-klo (a general designation for barbarians but later specialized for the Muslims in general). Cp. *Oriens III* (1950), p. 197 with notes 31-33.

10. J. Bacot, G.-Ch. Toussaint et F.W.Thomas, *Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire de Tibet*, Paris 1940-46, p. 17, translation p. 38.

pasture lands belonging to the four military districts¹¹ was carried out'.
 2. 'brog sog rcis kyi mjug bčade 'The end of the census of the Sog of the upper pasture lands was finished'¹². A general statement of Professor Thomas which deals with the Sog is to be found in his notes¹³: 'The Sog are several times mentioned in documents from Central Asia of a date long anterior to the existence of "Mongols" (8th century A.D.), who in the later Tibetan language are denoted by this name. They cannot be Sogdians, because the Sogdians in Central Asia were merchants and settlers, not nomads.'

The first statement of Professor Thomas, the rejection of translating Sog by 'Mongols' during the T'ang period will be accepted now by all scholars. But I am by far less sure about the second statement, especially if taking into consideration the Sog who captured the Tibetan official mGar sTa-gu. Therefore it seems not to be a surprise that Professor Li Fang-kuei¹⁴ in his article 'Notes on Tibetan Sog' straight-out identifies those Sog with the Sogdians. The Sogdians, it is true, were mainly merchants settling at all places of commercial importance at the two main trade routes of Eastern Turkestan, but from a brilliant article by Professor Pulleyblank¹⁵ we have learned that during that time the Sogdians were of political importance¹⁶, intermarried with the Turks, became Turkicized¹⁷, and served even in Turkish or Chi-

11. Concerning the ru bži cp. F. W. Thomas, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan I*, pp. 276 ff; G. Tucci: *Preliminary Report on two Scientific Expeditions in Nepal*, Roma 1956, pp. 77 ff; G. Uray: *Acta Orientalia Hungarica X* (1960), pp. 31-57.

12. For the translation of Thomas cp. p. 63. But G. Uray, l. c., p. 54 translates 'brog sog gi mk'os by 'account of the pastures and fallow lands'. That translation seems to me rather tentative, and before it will be confirmed by clearer evidence I prefer to translate *sog* by an ethnic name.

13. *Documents de Touen-houang*, p. 68.

14. *CAJ III* (1958), p. 139-142.

15. Edwin G. Pulleyblank, 'A Sogdian Colony in Inner Mongolia', *T'oung Pao XLI* (1952), pp. 317-356.

16. l. c., p. 323.

17. l. c., p. 331, 343, 351 (concerning An Lu-shan).

nese armies¹⁸. But on the other hand Professor Li's interpretation leaves us with a considerable amount of uncertainty. Firstly the entry of 694 A.D. is the only reference he adduces at all. He seems not to be aware of the fact that Sog and Sog-po later became names of the Muslims, too, nor does he discuss whether there is a difference between Sog, Sog-po, and the third variety which is written Sog-dag. He does not explain expressly the annal entry as a valid argument for his own hypothesis of identifying the people mentioned with the Sogdians although the syllable dag might belong to the name, forming an ethnic name Sog-dag which is one of the forms of that people's name to be found in Iranian texts¹⁹. But unfortunately our passage seems to be the most crucial one which occurs in Tibetan texts mentioning Sog, Sog-po, and Sog-dag.

We have to consider another possibility, too, when trying to disentangle the Sog-dag question. The -dag might be a plural particle used mostly for a small number of persons or things. This plural particle is called by Professor Thomas 'perhaps the most commonest form'²⁰ in the T'ang period documents. So there remains a good deal of uncertainty about the very short passage in the Tun-huang annals.

But we do have one reference to Sog-dag people where the context furnishes us with sufficient certainty to acknowledge that we really have to do with Sogdians. I am speaking about the story of the 500 Sog-dag merchants (500 being one of the usual schematic Buddhist numbers) who travelled in India²¹. This story is told in the Li-yul

18. l. c., p. 329, 332, 349.

19. Pulleyblank, l. c., p. 322 (note) cites the form soγdaq from the Turkish Orkhon Inscriptions; in Kāshgharī (Brockelmann's translation) we find suγdaγ, in the Sogdian Ancient Letters (R. E. Emmerick, *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan*, London 1967, p. 106) we meet with suγdik, and in the Middle Persian Bahman Yašt even suβdik (H. W. Bailey: *BSOAS* 6 (1930/32), pp. 945 ff.

20. F. W. Thomas: *Ancient Folk-Literature from North-eastern Tibet*, Berlin 1957, p. 40 (with numerous quotations).

21. Translation by F. W. Thomas: *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*, Vol. I, p. 319/20; edition of the text by R. E. Emmerick, l. c., p. pp. 89, line 88-96 of the scroll.

Čos-kyi lo-rgyus 'The Religious Annals of the Li Country', a manuscript P. Pelliot found in the hidden library of Tun-huang. Here the ethnic name Sog-dag is mentioned not less than six times. Because most of the Sogdians were merchants this identification seems to be fairly well-established. But the passage in the annals remains subject to doubt, because it seems not very likely, that Sogdians of a small colony in Eastern Turkestan would have faced the risk of capturing an official of the Tibetans who were very powerful in these days.

III

Mention should be made of the fact, that after the publication of Professor Pulleyblank's impressing article the Sogdians began to haunt orientalist periodicals. In that article has been stated that when dealing with the Chinese the Sogdians adopted surnames denoting the places of their origin²²: [1] K^cang (Samarkand), [2] An (Bukhārā), [3] Shih (Tāshkend). To have a Bukhārā-Sogdian origin Hugh E. Richardson assigned to the name of one important minister of K^cri-sroñ lde-bcan: Nan-lam sTag-sgra klu-k^coñ which is mentioned in the inscription on the Zol rdo-riñ and elsewhere. Mr. Richardson whose intrinsic merits of tracing out and translating not a few old Tibetan inscriptions writes in one of his articles²³: 'The rus Ngan does not appear often but may perhaps refer to people of Sogdian origin.' This interpretation has been stressed in note 11 on page 19 of the same article. In an earlier publication²⁴ Mr. Richardson deals in full with this important minister whose name is written sometimes (especially in the bKa²-t^cañ sde-lña) rTa-ra klu-goñ and the surname occurs thrice in the writing Nam (in rGyal-rabs gsal-ba²i me-loñ, the C^cos-

22. Pulleyblank, l. c., p. 32. The members in square brackets refer to the list of characters at the close of the article (p. 455).

23. 'Names and Titles in Early Tibetan Records', *Bulletin of Tibetology IV* (Gangtok 1967), p. 13.

24. H. R. Richardson: *Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa*, Prize Publication Fund, Vol. XIX, London 1952, pp. 3-5.

'byuñ of dPa'-bo gcug-lag 'p'reñ-ba, and in a Bon-po history, unknown, alas, until now, the Srid-pa rgyud-kyis k'a-'byuñ c'en-mo). This councillor is mentioned in the list of the 'Great Ministers' (blon-po č'en-po) of the Tun-huang chronicles to have been the successor of mČ'ims rGyal-zigs šu-ten and predecessor of sNa-nam rgyal-c'an lha-snañ²⁵. The writing Nam seems to have seduced Mr. Richardson to connect it with the Chinese character R. 21 An, assigning to that character an old final -m. But that is not the case since according to B. Karlgren²⁶ the T'ang period pronunciation was ʃân. The interpretation of Nam proves to be very simple: it is nothing else but a so-called bsdus-yig or 'abbreviated writing' for Nan-lam. Besides, the mentioning of the name Nan-lam is not as rare as one would gather from Mr. Richardson's statements. Moreover not counting the minister sTag-sgra klu-k'on we may trace several references to Nan-lam rGyal-ba mČ'og-dbyaṅs²⁷, one of the sad-mi mi-bdun (the first seven monks of Tibetan nationality ordained by the Bodhisattva Śāntirakṣita). In the Deb-t'er sñon-po²⁸ we read: 'The kalyāṇa-mitra Ts'ul-'p'ags was a native of Nan-lam and born in the year of the Iron-Male-Horse' (lcags pho rta = 1090 A.D.)'. In addition also the annals of Tun-huang mention the fact that Nan-lam was a place in Tibet²⁹: (year 52, A.D. 701) 'The king's mother K'ri-ma-lod resided at Nan-lam cal-sar-pa' (yum khri ma lod / ñan lam cal sar pa na bžugs šin).

25. J. Bacot, *Documents de Touen-houang*, p. 132.

26. B. Karlgren: *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, no. 4, p. 35.

27. *Rgyal rabs gsal ba'i me-loñ*, ed. B.I. Kuznetzov, Leiden 1966, p. 168, line 11; 178, line 3 (ngam(?) lam btsun pa rgyal mČ'og); rGyal-po bka'i t'an-yig 30 b 2: rgyal ba mČ'og dbyaṅs rta skad p'yogs bčur k'yab 'The neighing of rGyal-ba mČ'og-dbyaṅs pervaded the ten directions'. (This part of the text deals with the siddhis of Padmasambhava's disciples). Besides compare: *Une chronique ancienne de bSam-yas: sBa-bzed*, ed. R. A. Stein, Paris 1961, p. 51, line 2.

28. *The Blue Annals*, translated by George N. Roerich, Calcutta 1949, Part I, p. 89 (unfortunately at present the Tibetan text is not accessible to me).

29. Bacot, *Documents de Touen-houang*, p. 39; text p. 18: Cal-sar-pa seems to be c'al gsar pa 'the new grove'.

But fortunately we are in a position to identify that place with sufficient accuracy due to the data of the dGon-deb of the Bon-po³⁰. In the section of that manuscript which localizes the bon-po'i 'du-gnas so-bdun 'the thirty-seven assembling places of the Bon-po' in Central Tibet (from which part of the country the Bon-po were expelled by the Emperor K^cri-sroñ lde-bcan so that the list should be very old) we find the sufficiently clear data (p. 5): ñan lam ral gsum bsam yas nas skyid šod du yoñ ba'i bar 'Ral-gsum (Three clefts) of Ñan-lam is on the way from bSam-yas to sKyid-šod (the Lha-sa valley)'. This makes it evident that Ñan-lam should not be confused with Sogdian but has proved to be a perhaps small district between bSam-yas and Lha-sa the name of which seems to be obsolete in our days.

DIGRESSION ON THE MGAR FAMILY

It is quite understandable that Professor Li on this occasion tries to reconcile the names of the mGar officials with the data of the Chinese sources viz. the T^cang-shu and Hsin-t^cang-shu³¹. The following table gives his identification with mGar officials mentioned in the Chinese texts with the five sons of the great minister of Sroñ bcan sgam-po, mGar sTon-rcan yul-zuñ (Chinese Lu Tung-tsan). Already here we should point out the uncertainty of identifying each mGar nobleman of those times with a son of mGar sTon-rcan.

Chinese	Tun-huang (T. H.)
1. Tsan hsi jo [4]	bCan-sña ldom-bu (T. H. pp. 33, 131)
2. Chin ling [5]	K ^c ri-'briñ brcan-brod (T. H. 96, 132, 161, 167, 168, 169)
3. Tsan p ^c o [6]	Li: 'would correspond to some-

30. I owe a copy of that important book on the holy places of the Bon-po to the kindness of the learned Lopon Tenzin Namdak of the sMan-ri monastery.

31. Li, l. c., p. 141.

thing like Btsan (Brtsan) ba. He fled to China after the suicide of Khri'brin A.D. 699'. We shall see infra that he was bTsan-po Yon-tan rgyal-bzuñ.

4. Hsi to yü (kan) [7]

T.H. 36. Bacot is inclined to read sña-gu. 'Sta-gu ri-zuñ'. He is identified with that Sta-gu who was captured by the Sog A.D. 699.

5. Po lun (which means only 'blon' minister) [8]

Professor Li proposes to identify him with Blon Bcan ñen guñ rton (T.H., p. 38). This identification seems rather uncertain.


At any rate it would be useful to compare the data given above with the genealogy of the mGar family as it is given in the rGyal-rabs of the Fifth Dalai Lama (CFD)³²: mgar stoñ mes k^cri č^cags deⁱ sras mgar stoñ bcan yul bzuñ gis č^cos rgyal sroñ bcan sgam poⁱ blon po mjad / lugs gñis kyi mjad pas rjeⁱ žabs tog dañ bod³bañs la bka³drin č^ce / deⁱ sras bcan po yon tan rgyal bzuñ / de nas rim bžin lha gčig sñan ldem bu / k^cri sañs dum bu / k^cri gñer k^cri lčags / deⁱ sras stoñ mes k^cris snañ / k^cri stoñ stag gzuñ / blon č^cen č^cas pa sgo drug /

'mGar sToñ-mes-k^cri-č^cags³³. His son mGar sToñ-bcan yul-bzuñ acted as minister of the religious king Sroñ-bcan sgam-po. By actions of two manners he served his Lord, and was very kind to the Tibetan subjects. His sons were bCan-po Yon-tan rgyal-bzuñ, afterwards in succession Lha-gčig sñan-ldem-bu, K^cri-sañs dum-bu, K^cri-gñer, and K^cri-lčags. The sons of the latter were sToñ-mes k^cris-snañ, K^cri-stoñ stag-gzuñ, and the Great Minister Č^cas-pa sgo-drug.'

32. That material has been used already by L. Petech: *A Study on the Chronicles of Ladakh*, Calcutta 1939, p. 57, and by G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, Roma 1949, p. 629. I reproduce the text according to the edition of Ngawang Gelek Demo, Delhi 1967, p. 64.

33. The mythic ancestors have been neglected here.

According to that genealogy of CFD which has been derived from the rLans po-ti bse-ru which unfortunately is not accessible to me should be arranged in the following way:



Unfortunately this list does not enable us to identify with sufficient certainty the important K'ri-'briñ bcan-brod, because there are three sons of sToñ-bcan yul-bzuñ whose name begin with K'ri. That K'ri-'briñ cannot be identical with Lha-gčig sñan-ldem-bu (T. H. ldom-bu) seems obvious, and I do not believe Professor Petech any longer maintains his opinion of 1939 (l.c.).

But returning now to mGar sTag-gu who was captured by the Sog in 694 A.D. it seems to be possible or even more likely that he was a grandson rather than a son of the great mGar sToñ-bcan yul-bzuñ. sTa-gu is only a part of his name and represents a pet name meaning 'tiger cub'. Therefore I would not think it to be impossible to identify him with K'ri-stoñ (or: sto-ro) stag-gzuñ of the CFD pedigree³⁴.

34. The mGar pedigree of the kings of sDe-dge who claim for the old minister mGar sToñ-bcan yul-bzuñ to be their ancestor is of no use for us because Yon-tan rgyal-bzuñ wrongly is called the father of Lha-gčig sñan-ldem-bu, whilst that son of mGar sToñ-bcan is supposed to be the father of K'ri-bzañ dum-bu! Cp. Josef Kolmaš, *A Genealogy of the Kings of Derge*, Prague 1968, p. 64.

IV

For Sog-po which later denotes the Muslims as well as the Mongols we have to look for another origin. In this case it does not seem to be far-fetched if we remember a people that according to evidences found in the T^cang time documents as well as in later monastic literature had close connection with the Tibetans. I am thinking of the Saka people of Khotan, in Chinese Sai [9] but pronounced *Sək according to Professor Karlgren³⁵. This proves to be another adoption of a foreign ethnic name by the Tibetans from the Chinese language as it has been pointed out by me for Tibetan Hor which is derived from Chinese Hu [10]³⁶. The Tibetan Emperors used to call technicians as well as artisans for their building activities from the Saka people of Khotan. In the Č^cos-'byuñ of dPa²-bo gcug-lag 'p³reñ-ba (completed in 1564) we find an interesting passage which concerns the time of Sroñ-bcan sgam-po (ca. 620–649 A.D.)³⁷:

šar p^cyogs rgya dañ mi ñag nas / bzo (text: gzo) dañ rcis kyi dpe
rnams len / lho p^cyogs dkar po³i rgya gar nas / dam pa³i č^cos kyi sgra

35. B. Karlgren: *Analytic Dictionary*, no 773.

36. *Oriens III* (1950), p. 195. The use of Hu and its Tibetan derivate Hor is not consistent. In oldest times Hu was used for denoting the Hsiung-nu. Later on, as stated by Professor Li according to P. Pelliot (Li, l. c., p. 139; P. Pelliot: 'Les noms tibétains des T^cou-yu-houen et des Ouigours', *JA* 1912, p. 522 with note 3) it has been transferred to Iranian peoples. Pelliot does not give an exact ethnic equivalent to Hu (rendering Sog-po in the Chinese translation of the Li'i yul-gyi luñ-bstan-pa) but according to me it should mean here the Saka people and not the Sogdians, as proposed by Professor Li. Still later Hu became the Chinese equivalent of the name of the Uighur people (*Oriens* 1950, p. 195 and the old Sino-Tibetan world map of the T^cang times preserved by the Koreans: I. Nakamura, 'Old Chinese World Maps Preserved by the Koreans', *Imago Mundi*, Vol. IV (1947), p. 20/21. The reading of the Tibetan version causes considerable difficulties, because the copyist did not understand the Tibetan script and copied it quite mechanically. Nevertheless some of E. Teramoto's readings may be corrected (no. 3 seems to be not Takṣaśilā but t^cag-žig i.e. Ta-zig, Tā-žig or sTag-gzig, chin. Ta-shih 'Arabs'). Hor (no. 19) is given here as equivalent of chin. Hui-hu-kuo [11] 'country of the Uighurs'.

37. *Mkhas-pahi-dga-ston*, ed. Lokesh Chandra, Vol. IV, p. 9 fol. 18a 4ff.

rnams bsgyur / nub p^cyogs sog po bal po nas / zas nor loñs spyod
 gter k^a 'byed / byañ p^cyogs hor dañ yu gur nas / k^crimś dañ las kyi
 dpe (text: de) rnams len /

'From China and Mi-ñag in the east he adopted handicrafts and books on astronomy; from the white India in the south translations of the holy Buddhist religion were made; from the Sog-po and Nepal in the west he took (the knowledge) of digging up mines for the enjoyment of food and wealth; from the Turks and Uighurs in the north he took books (or patterns) of law and ranks (of his officials).'

In the same chronicle (p. 14, fol. 27 b 7) we find some data concerning the erection of the 'Red Palace' (po^c-brañ k^cri-rce dmar-po):
 lhoⁱ lčag ri nañ du sog poⁱ mk^car la dpe blañs te brag lha bkra šis kyi
 gžal yas k^aañ bya ba t^cog dgur brcigs.

'Inside the southern wall he erected (the building) called Brag-lha bkra-šis Palace nine storeys tall, after the pattern of a castle of the Sog-po.'

This palace was called later on the 'Sog-po Style Castle' as may be gathered from another quotation of the same book (p. 17, fol. 33 a 2):
 koñ jo^kor bčas p^co brañ gi šar sgor p^cebś pa p^co brañ sog po mk^car nas
 k^cri bcun gyis gzigs.

'The Nepalese consort (of Sroñ bcan sgam-po) saw from the palace (called) the "Sog-po Style Castle" that Koñ-jo with her retinue went to the east of the palace.'

I think in all those cases above-mentioned we have to translate Sog-po to mean Saka. And Saka people were certainly also the artisans mentioned by a chronicle for the time of the Emperor Ral-pa-čan (817-836). The statement is found in a passage of the later chronicle rGyal-rabs gsal-baⁱ me-loñ³⁸ which retains a considerable portion of old information: t^cugs dam du / 'u šañ rdo / dpe med bkra šis dge 'p^cel gyi gcug lag k^aañ bžeñś par 'dod nas / liⁱ yul nas / rigbyed la mk^cas paⁱ bzo bos /

38. ed. B. I. Kuznetsov, Leiden 1966, p. 185, line 13 ff.

bal po²i yul nas lha bzo dañ / rdo bzo ba mañ po bos nas / lha k⁶añ dgu t⁶og tu mjad.

‘When he wanted to erect as “receptacle of mind” (sanctuary) the temple called “the Incomparable Blessing and Increasing of Clergy” at ²U-šaṅ-rdo³⁹ he invited from the kingdom of Khotan artisans skilful in technological work. After having invited (also) from Nepal image makers and stone-cutters he erected the temple nine storeys tall.’

To the rGyal-rabs gsal-ba²i me-loṅ we owe also a statement of an old popular geography which associates Li²i yul (Khotan) and the Saka (Sog-po) very closely⁴⁰: yul dbus rgya gar gyi rgyal k⁶ams ni / za ²og gi bla bre p⁶ug pa dañ ²dra²o / sog po dañ / li²i yul šiṅ rta²i dbyibs ²dra ste / hor dañ rgya nag gi yul ni me tog pad ma k⁶a p⁶ye ba dañ ²dra ste / k⁶a ba čan bod kyi rgyal k⁶ams ni / srin mo gan rkyal du ²gyel ba dañ ²dra ste.

‘The kingdom of Madhyadeśa⁴¹ and India is similar to a raising canopy of heavy silk.

Sog-po and Li²i yul (Kaṃsadeśa) is similar to the shape of a car.

The countries of Hor and China are similar to an open lotus-flower.

The kingdom of the snowy country (skr. Himavat) Tibet is similar to an ogress (rākṣasī) lying on her back.’

This comparison of Tibet and her neighbours with a similar object seems to be fairly old. Due to the whole concept Hor is supposed to be here an equivalent of the name Uighur. In each of the four examples countries are mentioned which are very near to each other or even identical. Therefore Sog-po and Li²i yul should be names of the same reality viz. the Saka people of Khotan.

It is worthwhile to mention that Sog-po (the ethnic name together with a Tibetan noun-former) occurs already in an 8th or 9th century

39. Concerning ²U-šaṅ-rdo or ²On-čaṅ-rdo cp. Alfonsa Ferrari: *mKhyen-brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet*, Roma 1958, pp. 72/73 and 160.

40. Kuznetsov, l.c., pp. 3/4.

41. i. e. Magadha.

document from Eastern Turkistan⁴², although that document is not very informative for our problem.

Doc. Mi. IV 17 (wood). ze da³i lug rin du k^ca bstan pa / k^cyi čuñ la bre do / k^cyad nag la bre gañ / yañ k^cyi č^cuñ bre gañ / dge bsñen la bre p^cye(d) da[n] gsum / ³p^can legs la bre p^cye(d) dañ do / roñ po ban de la bre gañ / sog po la bre lña.

‘Assigned as price of ze-da⁴³ sheep to K^cyi-čuñ two bre⁴⁴, to K^cyad-nag one bre only, again to K^cyi-č^cuñ one bre only, to the upāsaka (Buddhist layman) two bre and a half, to ³P^can-legs one bre and a half, to the priest of Roñ-po⁴⁵ one bre only, to the Sog-po five bre.’

Dealing with this short passage F. W. Thomas seems not to be against translating Sog-po by ‘Sogdian’, but I think until we have cogent reasons to do so I would prefer to render Sog-po by ‘Saka’ and only Sog-dag by ‘Sogdian’.

Before concluding our considerations about the designation of the Saka in Tibetan mention should be made of one name of that people which sounds totally different from Sog-po: I allude to Śi-ku-na which seems to be of Indian origin⁴⁶. The passage referred to by the authorities cited in note 36 is given in the Č^cos-³byuñ of Bu-ston. Unfortunately at present I have no access to the original blockprint but Bu-ston’s statement⁴⁷ has been copied word by word by Sum-pa mK^can-po in his dPag-bsam ljon-bzañ⁴⁸: de³i dus su rgya gar dañ rgya ma yin pa³i rgyal po ya ba na dan palha ba (text: ba la bā) dañ ši ku na žes bya ba

42. F. W. Thomas: *Tibetan Literary Texts etc.*, Vol. II, London 1951, p. 344.

43. ze-da is an unknown word (perhaps of Chinese origin?).

44. bre, skr. droṇa, is a measure of capacity comprising about four pints.

45. Roñ-po seems to be one of the many gorge countries of Tibet or the Tibetan colonial empire.

46. Cp. R. A. Stein: *Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet*, Paris 1959, p. 263; Sylvain Lévi: ‘Notes sur les Indoscythes’, *JA* 1897, p. 10, note 1.

47. E. Obermiller: *History of Buddhism (Chos-ḥbyung) by Bu-ston II*, Heidelberg 1932, p. 173 (in a chapter dealing with the decline of the Buddhist faith comparable to the chapters of the Purāṇas which describe the Kali Age). Obermiller replaces Čikuna by Čakuna but the evidence of Sum-pa mK^can-po is against that emendation.

48. l. c., Part I, p. 50, line 20.

gsum 'byuñ. 'At that time kings of the three (peoples) Yavana (Greeks), Palhava⁴⁹ (Parthians) and Šikuna (Saka) will appear who are neither Indian nor Chinese.' It seems to be rather sure that the Tibetans did not realize that Sog-po and Šikuna originally denoted the same people.

49. For Pahlava in Indian sources see B. C. Law: *Tribes in Ancient India*, Poona 1943, p. 3.

LIST OF CHARACTERS

1	康	7	悉多于(干)
2	安	8	李論
3	石	9	塞
4	贊悉若	10	胡
5	金陵	11	迴胡國
6	贊婆		