

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



The Geographical Names in the Staël-Holstein Scroll

Author(s): G. L. M. Clauson

Source: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 2 (Apr., 1931), pp. 297-309

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25194251>

Accessed: 29/03/2011 14:11

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

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 Viśa-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 Śaka 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 Śaka 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 Kaṣi.*

(b) *ṣi niṣkici pīḍaki tṭye heri prracaina cu maṃ Śacū kūthi tti kaburi haḍaya.*

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

(c) *Bulumni Rrgyaḍisūmni & Sarnnidatti, the ṣau of the Ttāgutta province, & Saṃdū, the ṣau of the Hvaṃna [i.e. Khotan] province & Śvāṃnakai ṣau of Naṃpa Jamñai & they know the following towns:—*

I have little to add to what has already been said regarding these names. *Bulumni Rrgyaḍisūmni* is *Hbal Rgyal-sum* in the Tibetan text, *Hbal* (no doubt pronounced *m̐bal*) meaning "Nepalese". Tibetan scholars will note with interest that initial *r-* was still pronounced at this period. The alternation *ḍ/l* should be noted. Dr. Konow rightly calls attention to the attachment of the usual Śaka termination *-i* to the Tibetan monosyllables, we find the same phenomenon again later in the transcription of Chinese monosyllables. The equation between *Ttāgutta* 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 *ṇa*-*pa*. The equation of *nam* with Chinese 南 *nan*, in Karlgren's "Ancient" pronunciation *nām*, "South," is too tempting to be quite convincing.

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

(d) ". . The town of *Phimṇāṇna* and the inhabited town *Tsādīkāṇ* and the inhabited town of *Paḍaki* and the inhabited town of *Kaṇḍaki* and the inhabited town of *Ysabaḍiparrūṇ*. The town of *Raurata* [below the last three names are written in a second hand "*Nākichittipū*, *Nāhi* [*du* ?], *Hūttartūtī*, the Three Towns"] and the town of *Sūcaṇṇi* and the town of *Ṣacū* and the town of *Śalahi* and the town of *Hvinitcviṇṇi* [below the last two names are written in the same hand "*the town of Tcōḍyaimi* and the town of *Ūnikū*"] and the town of *Kvacū* and the (abandoned¹) town of *Śīniṣe* and the (abandoned) town of *Dviṇṇikyē* and the (abandoned) town of *Gākimaṇ'ni* and the abandoned town of *Hve'ttu* and the (abandoned) town of *Puṇ-kari* and the town of *Sauhicū* and the (abandoned) town of *Lāhipuṇ* and the (abandoned) town of *Kviṇṇikaṇ* and the (abandoned) town of *Lvainitsvaini* . . The town of *Kaṇṇmacū* and the town of *Leṇcū* 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.

Phimṇāṇna is correctly identified by them with 娑摩 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 *ttūsā* "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.

Tsādīkām is at first sight a difficulty. The obvious identification is 精絕 Ching-chüeh, Ancient *tsiäng-dz'īwāt*, 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 *tsiäng* > *tsā* is quite in order, but it is not easy to see why the Chinese should have represented *-dīk* by *dz'īwāt* when they had such characters as 敵 Ancient *d'iek* at their disposal.

As this identification is reasonably certain and that of *Kamḍaki* 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, 播仙 Po-hsien, Ancient *pua-siän* (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 仙 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) *Kamḍaki* = *Ka-dag* of the Tibetan documents (see Thomas, *JRAS.*, 1928, p. 565 ff.) = *Katak* of Mirza Haidar's *Tārīkh-i-Rashidi* (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 Śaka script for Z-) = Hsüan-Tsang's 納縛波 Na-fu-po Ancient *nāp-b'ī'ak-puā* with the pronunciation *nj-* or *nž-* for initial *n-* of which numerous examples exist in the contemporary Sino-Tibetan texts = *Nahi-chum* (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 *chum*) = *Nob-chuñ* (see Thomas, loc. cit.) = Little Nob or Lop = the modern Miran (see Stein, loc. cit.).

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

(iv) *draya 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.

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

Sacu 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 *Śalahi*, which reappears below in *Lahipum* presumably represents a modern *lai* or *lei*. *Hvinit-cvinnī* presumably represents *huan-* or *hsüan-chuan* or something of that kind.

It is tempting to identify *Tcidyaimi* with *Tsaidam*, but this cannot be regarded as certain, especially as *Tsaidam* is an area and not a town.

Ūnikū presumably represents something like *wên-ku* or *kou*.

The main lines of the remainder of the route are clear ; *Kvacū* = Kua-chou, *Kaṃmacū* = Kan-chou, *Lemcū* = presumably Liang-chou and not Lan-chou, though the latter is a possible alternative. This being so, *Śāhvā* 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 Īcū, and the town of Kau'yāki and the town of Dapicī and the town of Phūcamṇi and the town of Śakahi and the town of Tsīrikyepi and the town of Īsumi and the town of Yūsumi and the town of Hve'tseri and the town of Ttukicū and the town of Ttiyāki and the town of Tcyāṃtsvaini and the town of Kautāñai, which is the greatest of the Five Towns, the town named Hinibihiraki (?), the town named Śapari and the town named Yirrūṃciṃni, the town named Cammaidī Badaiki, the inhabited town of Argiñvā, the inhabited town of Ermvā, the town of Phalayākī, the town of Tturpaṃni, the town of Bāpaṃni.*

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 *Tturpaṃni* = 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. *Īcū* = 伊州 *I-chou*, an abbreviated form, which is also used by Hsüan-tsang for *I-wu-chou*, the old name of *Hami*.

Kau'yāki and *Ttiyāki* obviously belong together, the first elements being 高 *kao* "high" and 低 *ti* "low" respectively. *Yāki* was at first a puzzle, but I am inclined to think that it must be 億 *i*, Ancient *·iək* the first element in *I-ni*, Ancient *·iək-nji*, 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.

Phucan̄ni 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 mediæval 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.

Tsīrikyepi 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 且彌 *Tsü-mi* (*Chü-mi*), Ancient *tsi⁴⁰o-mjiē*, 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 γəu; alternatively they might be described as "left" and "right" (i.e. east and west), 左 tso, Ancient tsá, and 右 yu, Ancient jieu. Yū- might well represent jieu, or, at a pinch, γəu, and is in the right position, looked at from Tun-huang, for this identification, but Ī 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 州 chou, but I cannot identify the place.

Ttiyāki has been explained above.

Tcyāmtsvaini is no doubt another Chinese name, the first element being something like Chiang and the second possibly 泉 ts'üan (ch'üan), Ancient dz'ü^wän "fountain, spring". This latter element is also found in *Lvainitsvaini* in the earlier list.

I do not think that there can be any serious doubt that *Kautañai* is the Śaka spelling of the original (non-Chinese) name which the Chinese represented by 高昌 Kao-ch'ang, Ancient kau-t's'iang, the modern Karakhoja, which the Uighurs, whose capital it was, knew as Beshbalīq, "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?), Śapari, Yirrūncimni and Cammaidī Badaiki". This would at any rate explain why four towns should be singled out as "named".

Professor Thomas has suggested to me that *Badaiki* is perhaps the Turkish *balīq* "town"; the theory is an attractive one.

Śapari 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.

Yirrūmcinni is no doubt the name which the Chinese represented by 輪臺 Lun-t'ai, Ancient *luen-d'ai* (see Chavannes' *Documents sur les Tou-kioeu 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 Śaka (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 Argiñs 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 *Tturpaṃni* of our text. I have not identified *Bāpaṃni*.

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

(f) . . *Anittuṃga*, *Cāttuṃga*, *Tsāṃśāṃśī*, *Cimkiśāṃśī*, *Bvā'yūṃśāṃśī*. 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 *śāṃśī* represents 山西 shan-hsi (*Shen-si* is a misprint), Ancient *san-siei* "west of the mountains", is no doubt correct, and *tūṃga* is probably 東 tung, Ancient *tung* "east". I cannot, however, identify the names themselves.

The next section begins a new line.

(g) *In the Ijūva Yahida province, Aḍapahūtti, Bākū, Bāsikātti, Kurabīri, Kāribari*; these are *Ttūlisi*. Leumann suggests that *tūlisi* 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 *Ttūlisi* 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 鐵勒 T'ieh-li, Ancient *t'iet-lək*, 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 *Bākū* is meant for *Bugha* and *Kāribari* for *Qara Būri*), 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 *Aḍapahūtti* and *Añahidīpabhūtti* below compounds derived from a Prakrit or quasi-Prakrit original in which case *-pahūtti/pabhūtti* would be derived from the Sanskrit *prabhutā* "sovereignty" or *prabhūta* "sovereign, exalted", and *Añahidī* 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 *Aḍa-*.

The next section begins a new line and starts with two dots,
 (h) In the *Imjū Sī* province *Ttaugara*, *Ayabīri*, *Caraihi*,
Yabū, *tti kari Añahidīpabhūtti*, *Karattahapata*, *tti ttari*
Ttrūsahūta. *Rrūkibayarkāta*, *Cūṇūḍa*.

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 *Añahidīpabhūtti* 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 *Imjū Sī* is the Turkish *Yenčü Su* "Pearl River", i.e. Jaxartes of the Inscription

of Toñuquq (see Hirth's *Nachwort*, pp. 70 and 81-3) the 眞珠河 Chên-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 *Ttaugara*, 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.