NN 67

ACTA ORIENTALIA

ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE

ADIUVANTIBUS

B. CSONGOR, K. CZEGLÉDY, G. KARA, J. NÉMETH, S. TELEGDI

REDIGIT

L. LIGETI

HOC VOLUMEN REDEGIT

G. KARA

TOMUS XXV FASCICULI 1–3

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, BUDAPEST

1972

Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Tomus XXV, pp. 263—273 (1972)

IRANO-TURCICA

BY

J. HARMATTA

The origin of the Chinese name for the Turks represents an interesting problem from both the linguistic and historical view-points. Chinese 突厥 *T'u-küe*, Ancient Chinese *t'uət-kịwɒt*[1], Northwestern T'ang **t'oɹ-kyɹ*[2] apparently diverges from the form *Türk* by its ending. This phenomenon already struck the eye of J. Marquart almost seven decades ago when he tried to explain the difference between the genuine form *Türk* and Chinese *Tut-kut* (as the Ancient Chinese form of the name was restored at that time = *t'uət-kịwɒt*) by the assumption that the latter reflects a plural **Turkut*.[3]

Later on it was P. Pelliot who phonologically established and elaborated this theory in a more detailed manner.[4] According to him the Ancient Chinese form of the Chinese name for the Turks can be restored as **t'uət-kịuət*[5] because there exists a rather frequent gloss in the commentaries which states that the sign 厥 *küe* (Ancient Chinese *kịwɒt*) has the special Ancient Chinese reading *kịuət* in this name. On this basis Pelliot restored a prototype **Türküt* as the source for the Ancient Chinese transcription of the ethnic name *Türk*.

The difference between the genuine form and the variant preserved by the Ancient Chinese transcription was striking and demanded a linguistic

[1] B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica*: *BMFEA* 12 (1940), 489/a, 301/c.

[2] On the Northwestern T'ang dialect see Luo Charngpeir, *The Northwestern Dialects of Tarng and Five Dynasties*, Shanqhae 1933, and G. Haloun in H. W. Bailey, *Khotanese Texts* IV, Cambridge 1961, 171 foll.

[3] J. Marquart, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran* II, Leipzig 1905, 252, note 3 and *Über das Volkstum der Komanen*: *AKGW*, Göttingen N. F. XIII, Nr. 1, Berlin 1914, 72. E. G. Pulleyblank who could not use the book of Marquart, erroneously ascribed the form **Türküt* (instead of **Turkut*) to him (*JAOS* 85 [1965], 121).

[4] Apparently P. Pelliot recognized the problem and came to the same conclusion independently from Marquart but later, in any case, he acknowledged his priority. Pelliot treated the question several times: *L'origine de T'ou-kiue, nom chinois des Turcs*: *T'oung Pao* 16 (1915), 687—689 and later *JA*, S. 11, 15 (1920), 157, *T'oung Pao* 26 (1929), 250, *JA* 224 (1934), 92—93.

[5] I transferred all other Chinese transcriptions to the system used by B. Karlgren in his *Grammata Serica*.

as well as historical explanation. Pelliot tried to explain the ending *-üt* of the restored form **Türküt* as the Mongolian plural suffix and to regard the whole name as a plural of Mongolian type. The Mongolian plural form restored by Pelliot necessarily led him to the assumption that the Chinese became acquainted with the name *Türk* through the mediation of a Mongolian speaking people which was found by him in the *Juan-juan* whom he regarded as a people of Mongolian origin.

The theory expounded by P. Pelliot was so attractive and well-founded that it quickly gained further popularity and was generally adopted until recent times. P. A. Boodberg was the first to make an attempt to replace the theory of Pelliot by another explanation. He presumed that the name *T'u-küe* may correspond to a form **Türküz* which could alternate with **Toquz* and it may represent an archaic but true Turkish plural of *Türk*.[6] It was, however, convincingly shown by E. G. Pulleyblank[7] that this assumption is quite impossible from both historical and linguistic view-points.

Another attempt to explain the Chinese name for the Turks was made by Sir Gerard Clauson who ventured to interpret Chinese *T'u-küe* as **Türkü*, *i.e.* the Old Turkish form of the name *Türk* in his opinion.[8] Against his theory a series of arguments was similarly advanced by E. G. Pulleyblank who cast doubt on both the interpretation **Türkü* of Chinese *T'u-küe* and the reading **Türkü* of the Turkish form occurring in runic script and the possibility of a phonetic change **Türkü* > **Türk* assumed by Sir Gerard Clauson.[9]

As we can see from the above review, examining the problem of the Chinese name for the Turks, the two latter scholars restricted themselves to the linguistic aspect of the question and neglected the historical one. But as it was clearly seen by P. Pelliot almost sixty years ago, the appearance of the name *T'u-küe* in the Chinese sources also involves a historical problem which must not be disregarded. Notwithstanding, P. A. Boodberg and Sir Gerard Clauson focussed and at the same time restricted their efforts to the interpretation of the ending of the Chinese form. No wonder that attempting to give a new explanation of the Chinese name for the Turks recently, E. G. Pulleyblank followed the same methodological line. He expounded the ingenious theory that Chinese *T'u-küe* simply represents the genuine form *Türk*.[10]

Thoroughly revising the whole question Pulleyblank convincingly pointed to the weak point of Pelliot's theory. It is hardly plausible to think of

[6] P. A. Boodberg, *Three Notes on the T'u-chüeh Turks*: *Semitic and Oriental Studies*, *University of California Publications in Semitic Philology* 11 (1951), 1 foll.

[7] E. G. Pulleyblank, *Some Remarks on the Toquz-oghuz Problem*: *UAJ* 28 (1956), 35 foll. and *The Chinese Name for the Turks*: *JAOS* 85 (1965), 121 foll.

[8] Sir Gerard Clauson, *Turkish and Mongolian Studies*, London 1962, 84 foll.

[9] E. G. Pulleyblank: *JAOS* 85 (1965), 124 foll.

[10] E. G. Pulleyblank, *The Chinese Name for the Turks*: *JAOS* 85 (1965), 121 foll.

the mediating role of the *Juan-juan* because the first mention of the *T'u-küe* is only earlier by a few years than the fall of the *Juan-juan* state and one cannot assume that their name in a *Juan-juan* form became so firmly established that the Chinese would not have replaced it by the genuine Turkish form.[11] Another interesting point in Pulleyblank's analysis is the explanation of the Chinese gloss according to which the sign 厥 *küe* has the special reading *kịuət* in the name *T'u-küe*. He referred to the fact that in poetic rhymes of the sixth century and the Early T'ang Age words in *-ịvt*, *-ịwvt* rhyme with *-ịət*, *-uət*, *i.e.* the nuclear vowel of these words stood nearer to that in *-ịət*, *-uət* than to the vowel in *-ât*, *-wât*. Thus the phonetic realization of *kịwvt* was similar to that of *kịuət* at that period when the gloss discussed fixed the same phonetic value for *küe*/*kịwvt*.[12]

The explanation given by Pulleyblank himself of Chinese *T'u-küe* is mainly based on the theory that for the transcription of consonantal clusters in foreign names and words *ju-sheng* syllables, *i.e.* syllables closed by a final stop were used because they were the shortest ones in duration of all the Chinese tones as it can be assumed on the basis of the investigations by Chou Fa-kao.[13] Pulleyblank thinks that because of their shortness *ju-sheng* syllables were best suitables to represent even the total absence of duration in spite of the presence of the unwanted final consonant. By the help of this theory he assumes that the *ju-sheng* syllable 厥 *küe*, Ancient Chinese *kịwvt* in *T'u-küe* also represents the total absence of duration, *i.e.* it is only used for the transcription of the final *-k* of *Türk* so that in final result Chinese *T'u-küe* exactly reflects the genuine Turkish form of the name.

This solution of the much-discussed problem is very impressive and reminds one to a certain extent of the cutting off of the Gordian knot. It would be, indeed, tempting simply to cancel the whole problem of Chinese *T'u-küe* from Chinese and Turkish studies. By a closer examination, however, it turns out that Pulleyblank's argument is not at all convincing. It cannot escape the attention of anyone who carefully studies his arguments that the evidence quoted by him to support his theory is contradictory. It involves even more serious consequences that he over-simplified the problem and neglected the following essential points:

1. How, in what way did the Chinese become acquainted with the name of the Turks? We must not neglect the historical aspect of the problem either.

2. The first appearance of the *T'u-küe* antedates about a century the T'ang Age evidence by which Pulleyblank tried to explain the Chinese trans-

[11] E. G. Pulleyblank: *JAOS* 85 (1965), 122.

[12] E. G. Pulleyblank: *JAOS* 85 (1965), 121, note 2.

[13] Chou Fa-kao: *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 13 (1948), 159, quoted by E. G. Pulleyblank.

cription. L. Ligeti has, however, rightly emphasized that the practice of transcription in the transitional period between the Han and T'ang Ages may have been different from those of both the preceding and the subsequent epochs.[14]

3. The interpretation of the transcription *T'u-küe* is closely connected with the development and disappearance of the final consonants in Chinese. Pulleyblank narrowed down, however, the problem to the *ju-sheng* syllables which alone cannot explain the supposed transcription by Ancient Chinese *kịwɒt* of Turkish final *-k*.

4. There are some different philological levels in Chinese transcribing foreign names and words and the carefully elaborated system of transcription used by Buddhist scholars cannot be paralleled with the occasional transcriptions of Turkish words or names.

5. Moreover, one can reckon with the possibility that some dialectal differences are also reflected by the Chinese transcriptions.

6. Besides, we must not leave the possibility of foreign mediation out of consideration either.

7. Lastly, we cannot entirely disregard the real Chinese pronunciation of the transcribed names, *e.g. T'u-küe* was pronounced in Ancient Chinese as *t'uət-kịwɒt* or *t'oɤ-kyɤ* which diverges from Turkish *Türk* by its ending in spite of all efforts made by Pulleyblank considerably.

Now, if we re-examine the evidence used by Pulleyblank to support his thesis, we arrive at the following results. The samples quoted by him are of a different kind and can be classed into four groups. The 1st group comprises Buddhistic transcriptions taken from Hüan-tsang (about the middle of the 7th century A. D.) in which the final consonant of the *ju-sheng* syllable is of the same class as the initial consonant of the subsequent syllable:

Sanskrit *Śrāvasti-* = Chinese 室羅伐悉氐 *Shï-lo-fa-si-ti*, Ancient Chinese *śịĕt-lâ-b'iwɒt-sịĕt-tiei*

Sanskrit *Sthāneśvara-* = Chinese 薩他泥濕伐羅 *Sa-t'o-ni-shï-fa-lo*, Ancient Chinese *sât-t'â-niei-śịep-b'ịwɒt-lâ*[15]

Sanskrit *Phālguṇa-* = Chinese 頗勒宴拏 *P'o-lê-kü-na*, Ancient Chinese *p'uâ-lək-g'ịu-ńa*

Sanskrit *Kārttika-* = Chinese 迦剌底 *Kia-la-ti-kia*, Ancient Chinese *ka-lât-tiei-ka*

Iranian **Xvārizmīk* = Chinese 貨剌習彌伽 *Huo-li-si-mi-kia*, Ancient Chinese *χuâ-lji-zịəp-mjię-ka*

[14] L. Ligeti: *Acta Orient. Hung.* I (1950—1951), 172—173.

[15] Pulleyblank ascribes the Ancient Chinese value *bịâ'* to the sign 伐 *fa* in this word but his remark regarding *Pa-si-mi* shows that he meant *bịât* (= *b'ịwɒt* in Karlgren's system) which is the correct reading.

Iranian **Nūčkand* = Chinese 奴赤建 *Nu-ch'ï-kien*, Ancient Chinese *nuo-tś'ịük-kịɒn*

The 2nd group also consists of Buddhistic transcriptions in which the above rule of the corresponding final and initial consonants is partly disregarded:

Sanskrit *skara-* = Chinese 薩迦羅 *sa-kia-lo*, Ancient Chinese *sât-ka-lâ*

Sanskrit *sphāṭika-* = Chinese 窣頗胝迦 *sê-p'o-chï-kia*, Ancient Chinese *sək-p'uâ-ṭi-ka*

Sanskrit *svalpa-* = Chinese 薩縛剌波 *sa-fu-la-po*, Ancient Chinese *sât-b'ịwak-lât-puâ*

Sanskrit *svastika-* = Chinese 窣縛悉氐迦 *sê-fu-si-ti-kia*, Ancient Chinese *sək-b'ịwak-sịĕt-tiei-ka*

A common feature of all these transcriptions is the practice that all Sanskrit or Iranian syllables closed by a final consonant (except *-kand*) are represented by two Chinese syllables, *i.e.* the final consonant is transcribed by the initial of a Chinese syllable even in those cases where the whole syllable (as *e.gr.phāl, kār, val*) could be represented by one Chinese sign. This system of transcription is quite different from the one used in the case of *T'u-küe* where the syllable *Tür* is transcribed by Chinese *t'uət*. Accordingly these samples cannot be used as parallels to the Chinese transcription *T'u-küe* of the name *Türk* at all.

The quoted Buddhistic transcriptions emphatically raise, however, the question of both the Chinese final stops and the real pronunciation of these Chinese transcriptions. Taking into consideration the obvious impossibility of such forms as *e.g. sât-b'ịwak-lât-puâ* for Sanskrit *svalpa-*, Pulleyblank assumes that the final consonants of the *ju-sheng* syllables assimilated to the initials of the following ones. Thus he thinks, if I rightly understand his exposition, of a real Chinese pronunciation **sâbb'ịwallâppuâ, *sâkkalâ, *śịĕllâ-b'ịwɒssịĕttiei* etc. of the Sanskrit words *svalpa-, skara-, Śrāvasti-* etc.

This apparently necessary assumption raises, however, some further important questions, *viz.* whether such an assimilation can be regarded as a general rule of Chinese phonetic development and whether geminate or long consonants existed in the Chinese phonemic system of the T'ang Age at all. It seems that neither of these two questions can be answered positively. As regards the first problem, we can refer to the transcriptions of the type *T'u-küe — Türk* which would have been impossible if an assimilation of the final stops of the *ju-sheng* syllables to the initials of the following ones had resulted. Moreover, a great number of Uyγur and Iranian transcriptions of Chinese words is known, as *e.g.* Uyγur *tserki, fabši, yaγši, paγši, čangši, χaylim, šibqan,*

[16] E. G. Pulleyblank: *JAOS* 85 (1965), 123.

bägǰän, sügči etc.[17], Iranian *ytmyw, ḫymtwn*[18] which clearly show that no assimilation of the final consonants to the following initials resulted.

Even more difficult is the second problem, *viz.* whether geminate or long consonants existed in the Chinese phonemic system of the T'ang Age. I do not know any evidence for their existences, and the general structure of the Chinese phonemic system at the T'ang Age as it was reconstructed by B. Karlgren[19] and S. Martin[20] clearly speaks against it. The final solution of the problem we can only await, of course, from the sinologists; but in any case at the present state of the phonemic reconstruction of Chinese spoken at the T'ang Age, we cannot reckon with the existence of geminate consonants in its phonemic system.

Notwithstanding, it can hardly be doubted that the real Chinese pronunciation of Sanskrit *svalpa-, skara-, Śrāvasti-* may have been **sâb'i̯walâpuâ, *sâkalâ, *śi̯ĕlâb'i̯wosi̯ĕtiei* as it was assumed by E. G. Pulleyblank with the difference that perhaps he thought of geminates as the result of the assimilation assumed by him.[21] Accordingly, we should have to suppose the disappearence and absence of the final consonants of the *ju-sheng* words in these transcriptions. To draw such a conclusion is, however, impossible because we have abundant evidence for the survival of the final stops even after the T'ang Age. It was obviously this very circumstance which lead Pulleyblank to his theory of assimilation because otherwise he could not explain the obvious disappearance of the final stops in *ju-sheng* syllables. Thus the problem seems to have come to a deadlock.

Perhaps we can attempt and put to discussion the following explanation. In words containing *ju-sheng* syllables with the same class of final stops as the initial consonant of the following syllables, a geminate consonant would have resulted but such a phoneme was absent from the Chinese phonemic system of the T'ang Age. Thus we necessarily arrive at the conclusion that consonantal clusters containing consonants of the same class became simplified into simple consonants. Accordingly we can restore the following real Chinese pronunciation of Sanskrit *Śrāvasti-, Sthāneśvara-, Phālguṇa-, Kārttika-*: Ancient Chinese **śi̯ĕlâb'i̯wosi̯ĕtiei, *sât'ânieiśi̯əb'i̯wolâ, *p'uâləg'i̯uńa, *kalâtieika*. This phenomenon resulted in abstracting from the compound words such variants of *ju-sheng* syllables which had no final stop. In final outcome the *ju-sheng* syllables must have had two phonetic variants: /(C)VC/ = [(C)VC] + [(C)V], *e.gr.* Ancient Chinese /sât/ = [sât] + [sâ], /lât/ = [lât] + [lâ], /lək/ = [lək] + [lə], etc. in contrast to syllables of other classes, *e.g.* /lâ/ = [lâ], /ka/ = [ka], /p'uâ/ = [p'uâ], etc. These two phonetic realizations of the *ju-sheng* syllables permitted their alternative use for representing both foreign syllables with final stop and those without it.

Thus such transcriptions of Sanskrit *skara-, svalpa-* etc. as Ancient Chinese /sât-ka-lâ/, /sât-b'i̯wak-lât-puâ/ become easily comprehensible inasmuch as they represent [sâ-ka-lâ] and [sâ-b'i̯wa-lâ-puâ] respectively. The two phonetic realizations of the *ju-sheng* syllables caused as it goes without saying, no confusion in Chinese usage but they resulted in an ambiguity concerning the transcriptions of foreign names. Surely the Buddhist scholars were well aware of this fact and wanting to avoid the ambiguity in the transcription of Sanskrit names and terms, they used mainly the variants without final stop of the *ju-sheng* syllables in their transcriptions so that the Sanskrit syllables closed by a final stop became represented by two Chinese syllables.

If the above explanation proves to be correct, perhaps a series of striking transcriptions hardly comprehensible so far, can also be elucidated. I think of such cases as the Chinese transcriptions of Turkish *bilgä, viz.* Chinese 毗伽 *p'i-kia*, Ancient Chinese *b'ji-ka* and Chinese 苾伽 *pi-kia*, Ancient Chinese *b'i̯ĕt-ka* respectively. Here we can observe that the final consonant of the Turkish syllable *bil* remained unrepresented in one of the Chinese transcriptions. Other samples of the same phenomenon were referred by P. Pelliot[22] and L. Ligeti.[23] Taking into consideration that as a consequence of the two phonetic realizations of the *ju-sheng* syllables the reading of the transcriptions containing such syllables became ambigous, *i.e.* Ancient Chinese /b'i̯ĕt-ka/ could be read as both [b'i̯ĕtka] and [b'i̯ĕka], we can assume accidental interminglings between words of the *ju-sheng* class and the other ones in representing foreign syllables closed by a final stop as *e.g.* between /b'i̯ĕt/ = [b'i̯ĕt] + [b'i̯ĕ] and /b'ji/ = [b'ji] in the transcription of Turkish *bilgä*. This phenomenon can be observed at first inside the words and at that already before the T'ang Age. Later it becomes rather frequent also in word endings.

Now we pass over to the analysis of the other evidences quoted by Pulleyblank to support his theory. The 3rd group comprises two interesting transcriptions of Iranian names:

Čāč 'Tashkend' = Chinese 拓折 *Chê-chê*, Ancient Chinese *tśi̯a-tśi̯ät*. Besides, however, two other Chinese transcriptions of this name are also known,

[17] B. Csongor, *Chinese in the Uighur Script of the T'ang-Period*: *Acta Orient. Hung.* II (1952), 114 foll., Nos. 10/170, 12/165, 17/184, 20/183, 21/123, 26/181, 63/167, 68/177, 140/187.

[18] J. Harmatta, *Sino-Iranica*: *Acta Ant. Hung.* 19 (1971) 122 foll.

[19] B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica*, 14 foll.

[20] S. E. Martin: *The Phonemes of Ancient Chinese*. Supplement to the *JAOS*, No. 16 (1953). It must be noted, however, that the phonology of compound words, most important from the view-point of the discussed problem, is rather neglected so far.

[21] He does not say clearly what he thinks about the outcome of the assimilated consonants.

[22] P. Pelliot: *T'oung Pao* 26 (1929), 225 foll., 229.

[23] L. Ligeti: *Acta Orient. Hung.* I (1950—1951), 172 foll.

viz. Chinese 拓支 *Chê-chï*, Ancient Chinese *tśịa-tśię* and Chinese 赤時 *Ch'ï-shï*, Ancient Chinese *tś'ịäk-źi*. The first transcription in itself could offer a good parallel to the supposed correspondence *-kịwɒt* ~ *-k* but the other transcriptions show that here we have to do with the occasional intermingling between a *ju-sheng* word and words of the other classes analyzed above. On the other hand no such alternation can be observed in the case of *T'u-küe*.

Gaz 'place south of Balkh' = Chinese 揭職 *Kie-chï*, Ancient Chinese *g'ịät-tśịək* (Hüan-tsang). At first sight this item reminds us of the supposed interpretation by *Türk* of *T'u-küe*. We must not forget, however, that this name reflects the Buddhist scholarly practice of transcription using the variants without final stop of the *ju-sheng* syllables. Therefore, if Ancient Chinese /g'ịät-tśịək/ represents [g'ịätśịə], it cannot be parallelled with /t'uət-kịwɐt/ allegedly representing [t'uətkịwɐ] = Northwestern T'ang [t'oɪky], *i.e.* based on a different system of transcription. Besides, the possibility cannot be excluded that beside **Gač* there existed also a Middle Iranian form **Gačak* of the name *Gaz* and that it is this very form which was reflected by the transcription of Hüan-tsang.

Not far more convincing is the 4th group of evidence comprising the transcriptions of some Turkish names and words. Pulleyblank quoted the following examples:

Turkish *qutluγ* = Chinese 骨咄 (or 篤) 祿 *ku-tu-lu*, Ancient Chinese *kuət-tuət (or tuok)-luk*

Turkish *Basmïl* = Chinese 拔悉彌 (or 密) *Pa-si-mi*, Ancient Chinese *b'wat-sịĕt-mjię* (or *mịĕt*) and Chinese 拔息密 *Pa-si-mi*, Ancient Chinese *b'wat-sịək-mịĕt*

Turkish *Altun* = Chinese 阿六敦 *O-liu-tun*, Ancient Chinese *·â-lịuk-tuən*

Turkish *Az* = Chinese 阿熱 *O-jï*, Ancient Chinese *·â-ńźịĕt*

Turkish *kül* = Chinese 闕 *k'üe* or 屈 *k'ü*, Ancient Chinese *k'ịwɒt* or *k'ịuət* and Chinese 屈律 *k'ü-lü*, Ancient Chinese *k'ịuət-lịuĕt*

Turkish *Bars bäg* = Chinese 拔塞匐 *Pa-sê-po*, Ancient Chinese *b'ɯat-sək-b'ək*

Turkish *Barskhān* = Chinese 拔塞幹 *Pa-sê-kan*, Ancient Chinese *b'ɯat-sək-kân*

A great part of these transcriptions even contradicts the theory of Pulleyblank. Thus *qutluγ*, *Basmïl*, *kül*, *Bars bäg* with their final consonants powerfully support the interpretation by **Türküt* or **Türkür* etc. of *T'u-küe*. The testimony of *altun* and *Barskhān* concerning the word ending is neutral. The pair *b'wat-sịĕt-mjię* and *b'wat-sịĕt-mịĕt* show the intermingling between a *ju-sheng* syllable and a word of other class. The form */k'ịuət-lịuĕt/* = [*k'ịuəlịuĕ*] cannot be paralleled with *T'u-küe* either because it represents a scholarly transcription with the variants without final stop of the *ju-sheng* syllables.

Thus it is only the transcription by *·â-ńźịĕt* of *Az* which can perhaps be used as a parallel to the interpretation by *Türk* of *T'u-küe*, proposed by Pulleyblank. We must, however, refer to the obvious difficulty of the identification. From the historical viewpoint the identity of the name *Az* borne by a non-*Qïrγïz* people with Ancient Chinese *·â-ńźịĕt*, name of the royal clan of the *Qïrγïz* cannot be proved. On the other hand from phonetic viewpoint the supposed correspondence Turkish *Az* ~ Chinese *·â^{n}ź* is striking because there existed an initial phoneme *z-* in Ancient Chinese and *Az* could have been represented *e.g.* by *â-zịwok* more correctly. Besides, we cannot exclude the possibility that *·â-ńźịĕt* represents a non-Turkish form. Accordingly, the testimony of Ancient Chinese *·â-ńźịĕt* can hardly be used to support the interpretation by *Türk* of Ancient Chinese *t'uət-kịwɒt*.

In the last analysis, not even for the T'ang Age can the probability of the interpretation by *Türk* of Chinese *T'u-küe* be justified. The Chinese became, however, acquainted with the name *T'u-küe* long before the T'ang Age, about 545, when the first diplomatic contacts between Western Wei and the Turks were established. At this epoch the possibility of a transcription *t'uət-kịwɒt* of the form *Türk* is even less probable. Nor can we postulate a general rule according to which a foreign final consonant was exclusively represented by *ju-sheng* syllables. From among the Turkish examples quoted by Pulleyblank not a single one supports this theory. On the contrary the Chinese transcriptions of *qutluγ*, *Basmïl*, *kül*, *Bars bäg* clearly speaks against it. Besides, numerous transcriptions used in the T'ang Age can be quoted in which even the foreign final consonants which have an equivalent only among the Chinese initials, are represented by non-*ju-sheng* syllables. Thus for final *-s* we can refer *e.g.* to Chinese 波斯 *Po-sï*, Ancient Chinese *puâ-sie*[24] = *Pārs*, etc., for final *-š e.g.* to Chinese 翳德蜜施 *yi-tê-mi-shï*, Ancient Chinese *·iei-tək-mịĕt-śię*[25] etc. After all we must state that the restoration proposed by P. Pelliot of the foreign prototype of Chinese *T'u-küe* was essentially correct and will remain valid in the future too.

At that time P. Pelliot supposed a form **Türküt* as the foreign original of Ancient Chinese *t'uət-kịwɒt*. Without doubt this restoration is possible, but there are some other possibilities too. Disregarding the word ending which can also be restored beside *-t* as *-d*, *-δ*, *-r*, *-l*, we can properly interpret Ancient Chinese *t'uət*, Northwestern T'ang *t'oɪ* first of all as the transcription of a foreign syllable *tur*. Moreover, beside *küt/d/δ/r/l* Ancient Chinese *kịwɒt*, Northwestern T'ang *kyɪ* can also represent foreign *kit/d/δ/r/l* as it is clearly shown by the Chinese transcription *Ch'u-yüe*, Ancient Chinese *tś'ịwo-ngịwɒt*, North-

[24] Cf. B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica* 25/1, 869/a.
[25] B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica* 589/f, 919/k, 405/r, 4/l.

western T'ang *ts'iu-gyɹ* of Turkish *Čigil*.[26] Accordingly, beside the form **Türkūt* proposed by Pelliot, we can also think (at that possibly as of the firsf possibility) of a foreign prototype **Turkit*, **Turkid* etc. Such a form is, ot course, not attested, but perhaps it can be better justified as the form **Türkūt*.

At this point we have to examine the historical circumstances among which the Chinese became acquainted with the name of the Turks, *i.e.* we must also take into account the historical aspect of the problem. entirely neglected by P. A. Boodberg, Sir Gerard Clauson and E. G. Pulleyblank. According to the Chou-shu «in year 11 Ta'tung (= 545) (of Emperor Wen-ti of Western Wei) Emperor T'ai-tsu of (Northern) Chou sent an envoy, *An No-p'an-t'o* by name, a *Hu* from Tsiu-ts'üan, to the T'u-küe. Then they all felicitated one another and said: 'Our state will prosper as an envoy from the Great Empire arrived to us to day'».[27] This report has preserved the memory of the first diplomatic contact established between the Chinese and the Turks. Obviously from this date on we can reckon with the official use of the name *T'u-küe* in the chancellaries of the Chinese imperial court, *i.e.* here we have the possibility to elucidate more exactly how the Chinese form *T'u-küe* became established. From this point of view, it is of decisive importance that the Chinese envoy undertaking the first diplomatic mission to the Turks, was a Hu from Tsiu-ts'üan.

The term *Hu* was used as a general notion earlier to denote «Barbarians» and especially the Northern «Barbarians». Later the Western «Barbarians» too were denominated by this term. However, E. G. Pulleyblank convincingly pointed out that the word *Hu* was used to denote the Iranians of Central Asia and in particular the Sogdians since the end of the 6th century A. D.[28] As the first evidence for the activity of Sogdians at the court of the Eastern Turks, he mentioned An Sui-kia under Tu-lan qaγan, *i.e.* about the end of the 6th century A. D. There can be, however, hardly any doubt that the activity of the Sogdians as diplomatic commissioners dates back to an earlier epoch. According to the testimony of the Sogdian «Ancient Letters» there existed a whole series of Sogdian colonies in China, among others also in Tsiu-ts'üan at least since the end of the Han Dynasty.[29] The diplomatic mission sent by the Western Turks to the Byzantine imperial court in 568 was lead by the Sogdian

[26] Cf. P. Pelliot: *T'oung Pao* 26 (1929), 222, L. Ligeti: *MNy* 45 (1949), 170.

[27] Liu Mau-tsai, *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, Wiesbaden 1958, I, 6—7.

[28] E. G. Pulleyblank, *A Sogdian Colony in Inner Mongolia*: *T'oung Pao* 41 (1952), 318 foll. Cf. also Liu Mau-tsai, *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, 490—491 with further literature.

[29] Cf. J. Harmatta, *Sino-Indica*: *Acta Ant. Hung.* 12 (1964), 17 and *Eine neue Quelle zur Geschichte der Seidenstraße*: *Jb. f. Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 1971/II 138 foll, 140 foll.

ruler Maniach.[30] Surely the intermediary role of the Sogdians in the field of trade, culture and diplomacy already began during the Han Age.

No wonder, therefore, that the first envoy sent by the Chinese to the Turks, was also a Sogdian inhabitant of Tsiu-ts'üan. It cannot be, namely, doubtful that An No-p'an-t'o was indeed a Sogdian. This is already shown by his family name *An*, one of the Chinese family names borne by the Sogdians.[31] Besides, the name *No-p'an-t'o* can be interpreted as a characteristic Sogdian name. 諾槃陁 *No-p'an-t'o*, Ancient Chinese *nâk-b'uân-d'â*,[32] Northwestern T'ang *nây-b'ᵘân-d'â* undoubtedly represents the well-known type of Sogdian names which consists of the word *band(ak)* 'slave, servant, attendant' and the name of a divinity. As examples for this Sogdian type of name *Nanēβandak*, *Taxsīcβandak* etc. occurring in the «Ancient Letters» can be quoted. Sogdian *βand(ak)* «slave, servant» can easily be recognized in *-b'uân-d'â*, while *nâk* may represent Sogdian *Nāhid* «Anāhitā». Thus the original Sogdian form of the name can be restored as **Nāhidβand* (<Old Iranian **Anāhitā-banda-*) which might develope into **Nāhiβand* < **Nāxβand* < **Nāγβand*. The Northwestern T'ang form *nây-b'ᵘân-d'â* exactly reflects the latter development of the Sogdian name.

Accordingly, it was a Sogdian diplomat who gave the first official report to the Chinese imperial chancellary about the Turks. We must, therefore, necessarily suppose that the name of the Turks became established in the Chinese imperial court in its Sogdian form, *i.e.* the restored original **Turkit* of Chinese *T'u-küe* must be regarded as a Sogdian form. As I have pointed out long ago,[33] we can presume a Sogdian form **twrky* of the name *Türk* formed with the suffix *-aka-*. The plural of this Sogdian form **twrky* could be **twrkyt* = **Turkīt* (or **Turkīd*), exactly reflected by the Chinese transcription.

The intermediary role of the Sogdians in establishing the name of the Turks in Chinese cannot be regarded as an isolated case. As I pointed out, the Byzantine form *Sizaboulos* of the name of the Western Turk qaγan came also into being by Sogdian mediation. Taking into consideration the great importance the Sogdians had as merchants and diplomats in Central and Inner Asia, we can surely reckon also with further cases in which the names of Turkish peoples became established in a Sogdian form in Byzantium or in China. It follows that examining the origin of the Byzantine and Chinese names for peoples of Central and Inner Asia, we must never neglect the historical aspect of the problem.

[30] See J. Harmatta, *Byzantinoturcica*: *Acta Ant. Hung.* 10 (1962), 148 foll.

[31] E. G. Pulleyblank: *T'oung Pao* 41 (1952), 320, W. B. Henning: *BSOAS* 12 (1948), 603, note 2 with earlier literature, Liu Mau-tsai, *Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-küe)*, 491.

[32] Cf. B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica*, 77/f, 182/d, cf. 4/f.

[33] J. Harmatta, *Byzantinoturcica*: *Acta Ant. Hung.* 10 (1962), 149.