The Geographical Names in the Staël-Holstein Scroll

By G. L. M. Clauson

The "Staël-Holstein Scroll" is a convenient name to give to the document on which are inscribed the texts recently published by Professor Thomas and Professor Sten Konow in "Two Mediaeval Documents from Tun Huang", *Oslo Etnografiske Museums Skrifter*, Bind 3, Hefte 3 (Oslo, 1929). It bears on one side a Buddhist Sūtra in Chinese and on the other one document in Tibetan and one in the Śaka language (also sometimes called "Khotanese" and "Nord-Arisch"). These latter have no relation to the Chinese text and were written on it when it had become waste paper.

The two documents appear to be, so to speak, the "office copies" of the correspondence of a mission sent by the King of Khotan to the ruler of Sha-chou, the place now usually known as Tun-huang, in Western Kansu.

The Tibetan text falls into three parts, a rough and a fair copy of a memorial from the mission to the ruler of Sha-chou, and a metrical summary of the writer's principal points. This text contains no geographical names and we need not consider it further.

The Śaka text falls into five parts, the first three of which are preceded by dates in the fourteenth year of King Viṣa-sambhata of Khotan, a "cock year", which Professor Konow shows to be the equivalent in all probability of A.D. 757–8, with A.D. 769–70 as a possible alternative. The first section is short and its meaning obscure. The second is apparently, at any rate in part, a copy of the mission's passport and contains several lists of names. The third part is a report by the mission. The fourth and fifth, apparently in verse, seem to be irrelevant.

The editors have rightly emphasized the extreme importance of the lists of geographical names contained in the second part.
of the Šaka text as a new and independent authority for the geographical names in Chinese Turkestan and the adjacent areas in the eighth century.

My excuse for reopening the question so soon is that the editors have wisely preferred to publish their material at once instead, as is too often the case, of keeping it to themselves until they have squeezed the last drop of juice out of the lemon. It is in no spirit of carping criticism that I offer a contribution to the elucidation of their text, which they could no doubt have made themselves if they had kept the rest of the world waiting a little longer.

For the geography of Central Asia in and around the eighth century there is already a good deal of information, but it is of a very mixed kind and, apart from those Chinese authorities which were written specifically, or partly, for the purpose of giving geographical information, the texts often create more problems than they solve.

Apart from the Chinese authorities, which are the principal source of our knowledge, we have the following sources of information:

(1) The Arab and Persian geographers and historians, who in this period hardly come far enough East to throw much light on the present document.

(2) The "Runic" Turkish inscriptions which hardly come far enough south.

(3) The Tibetan documents from Sir Aurel Stein's and other excavation in Central Asia, extracts from which are published from time to time by Professor Thomas in this Journal. These contain a number of place-names but only rare indications of their location.

(4) The Kharoṣṭhi documents from the same excavations, which have been published in Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions Discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan, by Boyer, Rapson, Senart and Noble. These come from the right area but are some 500 years earlier.

(5) The Sanskrit documents published by Lüders in his
articles "Zur Geschichte und Geographie Ostturkestans" and "Weitere Beiträge zur Geschichte, etc." (SPAW., 1922, pp. 243-61, and 1930, pp. 3-60), with the former of which Pelliot dealt in his article "Notes sur les anciens noms de Kuča, d’Aqsu et d’Uč Turfan" (T’oung Pao, n.s., xxii, pp. 126-32). The names in these documents are unfortunately mostly just outside our area.

Modern works on the subject are too numerous to record, but special mention must be made of the works of Chavannes, Pelliot and Stein.

In working out the identifications of the place-names in our Śaka document we must remember that those names fall into three classes:

(1) Original Śaka names, of which the document gives the true spelling, while the Chinese authorities give the nearest equivalent of which the language is capable.

(2) Original Chinese names, represented as the writer of the documents heard them.

(3) Names neither Chinese or Śaka by origin, represented as the writer of the document heard them, while the Chinese authorities give the nearest equivalent of which the language is capable.

It is obvious that a higher standard of equivalence between the document and the Chinese authorities must be required in the case of the first two classes than is required in the third, for two things which are approximately equal to the same thing are not necessarily so approximately equal to one another. Moreover in the case of the first and third classes allowance must also be made for the fact that in some cases the Chinese equivalents were standardized at an earlier period, while the Śaka text represents the same name in a more advanced stage of phonetic decay.

As is well known, we are still only very imperfectly acquainted with the Śaka language and the translation of the text is by no means certain. About the transcription of the names, however, there is fortunately no doubt, as the text,
even in the reduced photograph which accompanies Professor Konow's paper, is admirably clear. On the other hand, in the case of some strings of names the division of the syllables into words is not always absolutely certain.

I will now proceed to examine in detail the text of the second part of the Saka document sentence by sentence, giving the original text where there is any doubt regarding the meaning.

(a) In the 14th year of King Lion Viśa'sambhata, cock year, 12th day of the month of Kajī.

(b) śi niśkici pīḍaki ttye heri prracaina cu maṇḥ Śacū kīthi tītī kaburi ḍāḍaya.

The order of the last six words is a little puzzling, but accepting Professor Konow's translation of niśkici pīḍaki this may be translated: "This (is) a letter of security inasmuch as the following are my envoys to the town of Ḡṛ Sha-chou." It should be noted that Ḡṛ is here transcribed cu, in other cases cū; there is no obvious reason for this.

(c) Būluṃni Rṛgyaḍisūṃmi & Sarṃnidatti, the śau of the Ṭtāgutta province, & Saṃdū, the śau of the Ḥvaṃnā [i.e. Khotan] province & Śvāṃnakai śau of Naṃpa Jamṇāi & they know the following towns:---

I have little to add to what has already been said regarding these names. Būluṃni Rṛgyaḍisūṃmi is Ḥbal Ṭṛgyal-sum in the Tibetan text, Ḥbal (no doubt pronounced mbal) meaning "Nepalese." Tibetan scholars will note with interest that initial r- was still pronounced at this period. The alternation d/l should be noted. Dr. Konow rightly calls attention to the attachment of the usual Saka termination -i to the Tibetan monosyllables, we find the same phenomenon again later in the transcription of Chinese monosyllables. The equation between Ṭtāgutta and the Tibetan place-name Sta-gu quoted by Professor Thomas is probably correct as the alternative form Ta-gu is also found (see JRAS., 1930, p. 280).
It was perhaps, as Professor Thomas suggests (loc. cit.), in the Cherchen area.

Professor Thomas’ identification of Jamña with a district of the same name in the Khotan area is no doubt correct. Nampa must in this case be a Tibetan adjective ending in pa. The equation of nam with Chinese 南 nan, in Karlgren’s “Ancient” pronunciation nâm, “South,” is too tempting to be quite convincing.

The next section, like some later sections, begins with two dots.

(d) “. . . The town of Phimmdmna and the inhabited town Tsādškān and the inhabited town of Paḍaki and the inhabited town of Kaṃdaki and the inhabited town of Ysabaḍiparruṇ. The town of Raurata [below the last three names are written in a second hand “Nākichittipū, Nāhi [du?], Hūttartī, the Three Towns’’] and the town of Śūcaṃni and the town of Śacū and the town of Śalaḥi and the town of Hvinitevīnni [below the last two names are written in the same hand “the town of Tcūdyaimi and the town of Ūnikū”] and the town of Kvacū and the (abandoned) town of Śiniše and the (abandoned) town of Dviyikye and the (abandoned) town of Gākimaṃ’ni and the abandoned town of Hve’ttu and the (abandoned) town of Puṃkari and the town of Sāhuicū and the (abandoned) town of Lāhipum and the (abandoned) town of Kvīṃnikāṃ and the (abandoned) town of Lvainitsvaini . . . The town of Kaṃmacū and the town of Leṃcū and the town of Śāhvā.

The editors have correctly stated that this is a list of the towns on the road running due east from Khotan, but it is exactly, not “roughly”, in geographical order, and is therefore of very great interest.

Phimmdmna is correctly identified by them with P’i-mo, Ancient pji [or b’ji?] -muā. Stein (Serindia, p. 1255) identifies this place with Uzun Tati; Herrmann (“Die alten

1 The word ttūšā “abandoned, desolate” is added here and in future cases below the line.
Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien,” vol. xxi of Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie, p. 98) puts it a little further to the east on the ground of the distances given by the Chinese authorities, but the disagreement is unimportant.

Tsādikām is at first sight a difficulty. The obvious identification is Ching-chüeh, Ancient tsjāng-dz’i-wāt, the modern Romok, the next “kingdom” to P’i-mo in the Chinese authorities, and this is no doubt correct. The transcriptions in Tibetan characters of Chinese Buddhist text published by Dr. Thomas and myself in this Journal (1926, p. 508 ff., 1927, p. 281 ff., 1929, p. 37 ff.), which come from this area and are approximately of the same date as this document, show that final -ng was frequently omitted in the Chinese dialect of the area so tsjāng > tsā is quite in order, but it is not easy to see why the Chinese should have represented -dīk by dz’i-wāt when they had such characters as d’iek at their disposal.

As this identification is reasonably certain and that of Kamdaki quite certain, Paḍaki must lie between the two and the obvious choice is Cherchen. Unfortunately, however, the Chinese name for this place in the T’ang period, Po-hsien, Ancient pua-siān (see Stein, Serindia, p. 299), though it starts well, clearly does not correspond to the second half of the word, neither have I been able to find any Ancient dāk, diek, etc., for which might be a scribal error. The identification, therefore, though probable, is not certain.

The editors have got almost all that is to be got out of the next three names and the note below them, but have not quite pushed things to a logical conclusion. The equations which are singularly complete are as follows:

(i) Kamdaki = Ka-dag of the Tibetan documents (see Thomas, JRAS., 1928, p. 565 ff.) = Katak of Mirza Haidar’s Tārikh-i-Rashīdī (for references see the Index to Elias and Ross’s translation) = Naki chettipo = Nob-ched-po of the Tibetan documents (see Thomas, JRAS., 1928, p. 568 ff.) = Great
Nob or Lop = the modern Charkhlik (see Stein, *Serindia*, p. 322).

(ii) *Ysabadiparrum* (*Ys-* is the Saka scription for Z-) = Hsüian-Tsang's 緣縛波 Na-fu-po Ancient nāp-b‘i’vâk-puâl with the pronunciation nf- or nz- for initial n- of which numerous examples exist in the contemporary Sino-Tibetan texts = Nahi-chuⁿ (in spite of Professor Konow's doubts, it seems to me that the facsimile permits us to read the syllable transcribed by Professor Konow as [du] as chuⁿ) = Nob-chuⁿ (see Thomas, loc. cit.) = Little Nob or Lop = the modern Miran (see Stein, loc. cit.).

(iii) *Raurata* = *Kroraina* of the Kharoṣṭhī documents = 樓蘭 Lou-lan, Ancient lexport = Hûttartī (apparently not mentioned elsewhere, but presumably the Tibetan name) = Stein's "Lou-lan site".

(iv) *drraya kanthe* = "the Three Towns", not merely "three towns" = the Tibetan mkhar-sum (see Thomas, loc. cit.) = (i), (ii) and (iii) above.

This table enables us to tie up two or three loose ends in the nomenclature of this area.

*Suceamnî* is correctly identified by the editors with 鬱昌 Shou-ch'ang, Ancient bjerg-t's'jang, now Nan-hu, the only place of any importance between the Lou-lan site and Tun-huang.

*Saeu* is of course Sha-chou, i.e. Tun-huang.

I have not succeeded in identifying the next four places, but as it seems probable that they are all Chinese they can be left for further consideration to the Sinologists.

The element -lahi is Salahi, which reappears below in Lakipun presumably represents a modern lai or lei. Hvinicovimni presumably represents huan- or hsüan-chuan or something of that kind.

It is tempting to identify Tsidyaimi with Tsaidam, but this cannot be regarded as certain, especially as Tsaidam is an area and not a town.
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Uniku presumably represents something like wên-ku or kou.

The main lines of the remainder of the route are clear; Kvacū = Kua-chou, Kammacū = Kan-chou, Lẹncū = presumably Liang-chou and not Lan-chou, though the latter is a possible alternative. This being so, Šāhvā can hardly be anything except Hsi-an-fu, the capital of the T'ang Empire, at that time called Ch'ang-an, but the Chinese name which it represents is not obvious.

I have not succeeded in identifying the intermediate towns, but as they all lie within China on a known route they are not of great importance.

There follows a clause of five words, preceded and followed by two dots; it is not clear whether it is to be read with the preceding phrase and translated “The above which are inhabited towns” or with the following phrase and translated “The following which are inhabited towns”; the latter seems the more probable.

(e) The town of Ícū, and the town of Kau'yāki and the town of Dapici and the town of Phūcanī and the town of Šakahī and the town of Tsirikyepl and the town of Īsumi and the town of Yūsumi and the town of Hve'teserī and the town of Ttukicū and the town of Ttivāki and the town of Tcyạ̄ntsvainī and the town of Kutaṇāi, which is the greatest of the Five Towns, the town named Hinibihirakī (?), the town named Šapari and the town named Yirruṃení, the town named Caṃmaidī Bădaiki, the inhabited town of Argịvā, the inhabited town of Ermvā, the town of Phalayāki, the town of Tturpaṇnī, the town of Bāpaṇnī.

It is in connection with this list of names that I think that I can claim to have made definite progress beyond the original editors, who have contented themselves with the obvious identification Tturpaṇnī = Turfan, together with two identifications which are incorrect. It is clear that the list contains the names of places on the old “northern route” running north-west from Tun-huang. Unlike the list of names on the
southern route, which the mission had presumably traversed themselves, this list, which was no doubt compiled from hearsay, is not in rigid geographical order and, as a consequence, the problems of identification are much more difficult.

The first name on the list, however, is that of the first place on the road. ÑICū = CIC1 I-chou, an abbreviated form, which is also used by Hsüan-tsang for I-wu-chou, the old name of Hami.

Kau'yāki and Tliyāki obviously belong together, the first elements being 高 kao "high" and 低 tī "low" respectively. Yāki was at first a puzzle, but I am inclined to think that it must be 古 i, Ancient 古k the first element in I-ni, Ancient 古k-njī, the Chinese transcription used in the translation of the Candragarbasutra for the Sanskrit name of the modern Qarashahr, Agni, which was inferred from Hsüan-tsang's transcription A-chi-ni and has now actually been found in a Sanskrit document from Qyzyl (see H. Lüders, "Weitere Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie von Ostturkestan," SPAW., 1930, p. 27). "Upper" and "Lower Agni" are presumably two parts, perhaps Northern and Southern, of the "kingdom" of Qarashahr.

Dapici looks rather like another Chinese name Dapi-ci, but I cannot identify it, or either element in it.

Phucāmpi is almost certainly Pichan. This name is spelt Pucian in the account of Niccolo and Maffeo Polo's travels (see the map of routes of mediaeval travellers in Richthofen's China, vol. i).

Šakahi looks like a local name received direct and not through a Chinese medium, but I cannot identify it.

Tsirikyepei is presumably Sirkip, 15 miles east of Karakhoja on the road to Pichan (see Stein's Innermost Asia, p. 612).

With Īsumi and Yūsumi, however, we apparently move eastwards again, since it is very tempting to identify them with the two kingdoms of 帝 Tsū-mi (Chü-mi), Ancient tsū-wo-mjig, just west of the Barkol Lake, but the first syllables present some difficulty. The two kingdoms are usually
described as "anterior" and "posterior" 前 ch‘ien, Ancient dz‘ien, and 後 hou, Ancient γou; alternatively they might be described as "left" and "right" (i.e. east and west), 左 tso, Ancient tsā, and 右 yu, Ancient jīu. 右 might well represent jișu, or, at a pinch, γou, and is in the right position, looked at from Tun-huang, for this identification, but  înt is not explicable on either hypothesis.

Hve’tseri is another puzzle, it does not look Chinese in form.  
Ttukicū looks like a Chinese name, ttuki representing tu, Ancient tuk or t’u, Ancient t’uk, and cū t ŭ chou, but I cannot identify the place.

Ttiiyäki has been explained above.

Tcyâmtswaynei is no doubt another Chinese name, the first element being something like chiang and the second possibly 泉 ts‘üan (ch‘üan), Ancient dz‘üan "fountain, spring". This latter element is also found in Lvainitswaynei in the earlier list.

I do not think that there can be any serious doubt that Kautanai is the Saka spelling of the original (non-Chinese) name which the Chinese represented by 高昌 Kao-ch‘ang, Ancient kāu-t*s‘iang, the modern Karakhoja, which the Uighurs, whose capital it was, knew as Beshbaliq, "the Five Towns."

The next name is uncertain. The editors give the alternative readings, Hinibihiraki as a proper name and hi ni bihi Raki "and in addition to them Raki". I have a strong suspicion, however, that hini is to be connected with the Sanskrit hīna “small” and that the whole phrase means "and the lesser ones are the towns named Raki (or Bihiraki ?), Sapari, Yirrāncınnı and Cammaidi Baďaiki". This would at any rate explain why four towns should be singled out as "named".

Professor Thomas has suggested to me that Baďaiki is perhaps the Turkish baliq “town”; the theory is an attractive one.  
Sapari is perhaps to be connected with the name Sha-po-liu,
which is found in the genealogies of the Western Turkish Qaghans, and is perhaps Tokharian by origin.

Yirruncimni is no doubt the name which the Chinese represented by 胜 鼎 Lun-t'ai, Ancient lu'en-d'ai (see Chavannes' Documents sur les Tou-kioue Occidentaux, p. 11), the modern Urumtsi, though not necessarily in the same place as the latter now is.

The next two names are uncertain; -vā is the Locative Plural in Saka (see Hoernle, Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan, Oxford, 1916, p. 233), and the phrase may mean "the inhabited towns in the Argiňs and the Erms".

I am inclined to connect Phalayāki with the modern Buluyuk, shown in the maps in Sir A. Stein's Innermost Asia, 8 miles north of Turfan, which is of course the Tturpaññi of our text. I have not identified Bāpaññi.

The next section commences a new line, and is preceded by two dots.

(f) . . Anittumga, Cältumga, Tsāṁsāṃśi, Cĩmkišāṃśi, Bu'yūṁsāṃśi. These names are obviously Chinese; and, as the word "town" is not mentioned in connection with them, we may assume that they are the names of districts, in which case the editors' suggestion that sāṁśi represents 西 shan-hsi (Shen-si is a misprint), Ancient 筍-siei "west of the mountains", is no doubt correct, and tumga is probably 東 tung, Ancient tung "east". I cannot, however, identify the names themselves.

The next section begins a new line.

(g) In the Ijuva Yahida province, Aḍapahüti, Bākū, Bäsikătti, Kurabīri, Kāribari; these are Ttulisi. Leumann suggests that ttiši here means "twenty-four", a suggestion which, with all deference to a great scholar, is singularly inept.

It will be noted that here too there is no mention of "towns". I suggest that in Ttulisi we have the Turkish tribal name which is usually spelt Tölös. This spelling is of course incorrect,
since Turkish does not admit ö elsewhere than in the first syllable. Chavannes (Documents sur les Tou-kioue Occidentaux, Index) gives the alternative forms Tölös and Tülis, the latter identical with our work here; the Chinese form 鐘 勒 T'ieh-li, Ancient t'iet-lok, though an inadequate representation of either, is nearer the latter form than the former. The Tölös were a large tribe, which was subsequently merged in the Uighur confederation and in the eighth century they occupied an area somewhat to the north of the places mentioned in section (e) of this text. It is perhaps significant that the tribe was made up of five sub-tribes, and the five names in this section may be intended to be the names of those tribes, but they do not look particularly Turkish (unless Bâkû is meant for Bugha and Kâribari for Qara Bûri), and have no points of similarity with the Chinese list quoted by Chavannes in Documents sur les Tou-kioue Occidentaux, p. 34. There is, however, a second possibility somewhat inconsistent with the above. It is tempting to see in Aṇapahūṭṭi and Aṇahiḍi-pabhūṭṭi below compounds derived from a Prakrit or quasi-Prakrit original in which case -pabhūṭṭi/pabhūṭṭi would be derived from the Sanskrit prabhutā "sovereignty" or prabhūta "sovereign, exalted", and Aṇahiḍi would represent the Iranian goddess Anāhitā and the latter word would then mean "having Anāhitā as their sovereign". It is difficult, however, in that case to explain Aṇa-

The next section begins a new line and starts with two dots.

(h) In the Ḫimjû Sī province Ttauagara, Ayabīri, Caraihi, Yabū, tti kari Aṇahiḍipabhūṭṭi, Karattahapata, tti ttari Ttrūṣahūla. Rrūkibayarkātā, Cûnūḍa.

It is not clear whether tti kari, tti ttari mean "these on the one hand", "those on the other hand", or are additional names, but the former seems the more probable, particularly if Aṇahiḍipabhūṭṭi is an adjective.

It is not at all clear with what area we have to deal here. It is difficult to resist the theory that Ḫimjû Sī is the Turkish Yenĉû Su "Pearl River", i.e. Jaxartes of the Inscription
of Toňuquq (see Hirth's Nachwort, pp. 70 and 81-3) the 璀 珠 河 Chen-chu Ho, "Pearl River" of the T'ang Shu, ch. 221b, p. 3, and elsewhere. In that case the area is to be sought west of the Pamirs, which would agree with Tlaugara, which is no doubt the area known to the Arabs as Tokharestan, the country of the Tokharians. This, however, in fact lay about the upper waters of the Oxus, and not the Jaxartes.

Of the other names I can make nothing, except that they are clearly not Chinese and have an Iranian rather than a Turkish flavour. This would agree with a situation west of the Pamirs, but it is odd to find no familiar name among them beyond the first.