Tibetan Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. V: (*a*) The Dru-gu (Great Dru-gu and Drug-cun; the Dru-gu *cor* and the Bug *cor*; the Dru-gu and Go-sar; the title *Bog-do*; conclusion); (*b*) the Hor; (*c*) the Phod-kar

BY

F. W. THOMAS

[*From the* JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, *October, 1931.*]

Tibetan Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. V: (*a*) The Dru-gu (Great Dru-gu and Drug-cun; the Dru-gu *cor* and the Bug *cor*; the Dru-gu and Ge-sar; the title *Bog-do*; conclusion); (*b*) the Hor; (*c*) the Phod-kar

By F. W. THOMAS

SOME texts mentioning the Dru-gu have been given above (1927, pp. 68, 80, 85, 808; 1929, pp. 78 sqq., 559, 560, 583; 1930, pp. 56, 84–5, 274, 281), and reference was made to the divergent views of Colonel Waddell and Professor Pelliot, the former having identified the Dru-gu with the Tu-yü-hun of Chinese history, and the latter with the Turkish Uigurs. The name *Drug-gu* was first made known by Rockhill, who cited (*The Life of the Buddha*, p. 240) from the Tibetan Annals of Khotan a reference to a destructive invasion of the Khotan country by that people during the reign of King Vijaya-Kīrti, whose date is not known, but who evidently belonged to a comparatively early generation. The name of the Dru-gu king appears as 'A-no-śos or 'A-no-mo-śoṅ. From the same Annals some further citations were given in an appendix to Sir A. Stein's *Ancient Khotan* (pp. 581–3). Thus a certain King Vijaya-Saṅgrāma retaliated for the apparently forgotten Dru-gu invasion by devastating the country of that people, causing great slaughter, to atone for which he built the monastery Ḫgu-gżan or Ḫgu-żan-ta. A subsequent Vijaya-Saṅgrāma was killed by the Dru-gu in the course of a journey to China; and a daughter of a still later king, Vijaya-Ḫzaḫ-la, was married to the king of Gu-zin, who may have been a Dru-gu. Unfortunately, these citations contain no clear geographical or temporal information.

References in the Tibetan Chronicle

Dated references to the Dru-gu are, however, furnished by the Tibetan chronicle which was described in an earlier paper

(*JRAS.*, 1927, pp. 51–2). The passages may be cited in order.

1. Chronicle, ll. 11: Year 4 (a Hog year) = A.D. 675.

Blon.Btsan.sñas | Żims : gyi.Gu : ran.du : Żaṅ.żuṅ.gyi : mkhos : bgyiste | Dru.gu.yul.du : Ltaṅ.yor.mchis.

"Councillor Btsan-sña, having defeated the Żaṅ-żuṅ in Gu-ran of Żims, went to Ltaṅ-yor in the Dru-gu country."

Notes

In A.D. 673, two years before, the Mgar Btsan-sña Ldom-bu had joined with Khri-ḫbriṅ Btsan-brod (concerning whom see *JRAS.*, 1927, p. 54) in raising a force in Stag-tsal of Duṅs.

Żims and Gu-ran should be in the region of Gu-ge, in the Himālaya, where Żaṅ-żuṅ is usually located. Ltaṅ-yor appears to be not elsewhere mentioned; but the syllable *yor*, found also in the name of Gtse-nam-yor (in Mdo-smad), possibly means "cairn", since it occurs in *tho-yor* "boundary cairn".

2. Chronicle, ll. 14–5: Year 5 (Mouse) = A.D. 676.

Blon . Btsan.sñas : Dru.gu.yul : du.draṅste | ldum.bu : Khri.bśos : khrom.ḫtsald.

"Councillor Btsan-sña, having marched into the Dru-gu country, sent vegetables to Khri-bśos town."

Khri-bśos seems not to be known, see *infra*, pp. 825–6.

3. Chronicle, ll. 41–2: Year 15 (Dog) = A.D. 686.

Blon : Khri . ḫbriṅ . gyis | Dru.gu : yul . du : Draṅ . żes : bgyi.bgyi[1].pa.las | phyi.dalte | dbyar : ḫdun.Śoṅ.snar : ḫdus.

"Councillor Khri-ḫbriṅ, lingering outside [on the way] from a [place] called Draṅ in the Dru-gu country, held the summer assemblage in Śoṅ-sna."

Concerning Draṅ and Śoṅ-sna, see *infra*, p. 825. These "assemblies" or gatherings of ministers or armies have been mentioned already several times (see *JRAS.*, 1927, p. 70; 1928, p. 575).

[1] Repeated in error.

3a. Chronicle, ll. 58–9 : Year 21 (Dragon) = A.D. 692.

Btsan.po . N̄en . kar . bžugs . śiṅ | dbyar . ḥdun . Śoṅ . snar . ḥduste | Mṅan.chen.po.drug.du.bskos |

" The Btsan-po residing in N̄en-ka, the summer assemblage being held in Śoṅ-sna, the Mṅan-chen-po was levied in six [battalions] *or* the Mṅan-chen-po was levied in [*or* for] the Drug country."

The Mṅan-chen-po, mentioned also in l. 197—the Mṅan being mentioned again in ll. 108, 153, 168—seems to be a regiment. Since the alternative rendering which brings in the Drug is probably not correct, the only reason for quoting this passage here is the verification of the place-name Śoṅ-sna.

4. Chronicle, ll. 44–5 : Year 16 (Hog) = A.D. 687.

Blon.Khri.ḥbriṅ.gyis | Dru.gu : Gu.zan.yul : du.draṅs.

" Councillor Khri-ḥbriṅ marched into the Dru-gu Gu-zan country."

Notes

Concerning Gu-zan, see *infra*, pp. 822 sqq.

5. Chronicle, l. 50 : Year 18 (Ox) = A.D. 689.

Blon.che.Khri.ḥbriṅ.Dru.gu.yul.nas : slar : ḥkhorte |

" The great Councillor Khri-ḥbriṅ returning from the Dru-gu country."

6. Chronicle, ll. 79–80 : Year 29 (Mouse) = A.D. 700.

Btsan.po . . . | Ton.Ya.bgo : Kha.gan.Dru.gu.yul.du.btaṅ |

" The Btsan-po . . . sent the Khagan Ton Yab-go into the Dru-gu country.

Notes

Of this Ton Yab-go Khagan, who is mentioned previously (ll. 64 and 77) as having done homage (*phyag-ḫtsald*) in A.D. 694 and 699, and whose Turkish name and titles remind us of a famous early Khagan (see Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-Kiue occidentaux*, index), nothing further seems to be known. Is Ton Yab-go related to the Khagan A-che-na T'oei

tse, a "creature of the Tibetans", mentioned by Chavannes, pp. 77 and 281 ?

7. Chronicle, ll. 201–2: Year 58 (Serpent) = A.D. 729.

Blon . chen . po : Cuń . bzań . gyis | dgun . ḥdun : Skyi . Śo . ma . rar . bsduste | Mun . magi : snon . god . brtsis | dmag : Dru . gu : yul . du . draṅs : pha : slar : ḥkhord.

"The Great Councillor Cuń-bzań, having held the winter muster in Śo-ma-ra of Skyi, made a counting of the reinforcements and losses of the Mun troops, and led his army into the Dru-gu country and returned."

Notes

Cuń-bzań Ḥor-mań of Ḥbro in Mdo-smad (l. 194) became Chief Minister in the year 57 = A.D. 728 (l. 198); he is frequently mentioned in the Chronicle.

On Skyi and Śo-ma-ra see *JRAS.*, 1927, p. 816. The district must have been in or near Mdo-smad, and probably on the northern or Turkestan side of it.

The expression *mun-dmag*, denoting some kind of troops, has been cited previously (*Two Medieval Documents from Tun-Huang*, by F. W. Thomas and Sten Konow, p. 129). The exact meaning being unknown, we may here take note of—

7a. M.I. iv, 132 (paper, c. 30.5 × 8 cm.; a fragment of a verso; l. 1 of good, cursive, *dbu-can* script, rather faint).

ལ | : | -i . [lo . la] || skun . mkhar . | Nob . chuṅu . G-yuń . druń . rtser | rkyen . gyi | mun . dmag . Spu . tshugs | dkar |

"Year —. At G-yuń-druń-trse of Little Nob town. Of the property. Spu-tshugs (? *not a proper name* ?) of the *mun* troops. White (wheat)."

Concerning G-yuń-druń-rtse in Little Nob see *JRAS.*, 1928, pp. 586–7.

In the other occurrences of *mun-dmag* in the Chronicle (ll. 6, 51–2) it is again a question of countings.

8. Chronicle, ll. 221–2: Year 65 (Mouse) = A.D. 736.

Cog . ro . maṅ . po . rje . Khyi . chuṅ . gyis | Dru . gu . yul . du . draṅs.

"The Great Chief Khyi-chuṅ of Cog-ro marched into the Dru-gu country."

Notes

On Cog-ro in Mdo-smad and on the expression *maṅ-po-rje*, denoting a feudatory chief, see *JRAS.*, 1927, pp. 57 and 65.

In these passages we have reports of expeditions into the Dru-gu country ranging from A.D. 675–736. The places named, Ltaṅ-yor, Khri-bśos, Draṅ, Śoṅ-sna, Gu-zan are all recur provisionally unidentified; but to some of them we shall *infra* (pp. 822 sqq.). There are no other special indications as to the direction in which the Dru-gu country is to be sought.

References in the Documents

When we turn to the documents from Mīrān, Mazār Tāgh and Tun-huang (Śa-cu), we are no longer furnished with definite dates. Some of the documents are indeed dated in years of the twelve-year cycle; but this indication is provisionally almost useless. Nor among the numerous officials mentioned has any one been found who can be identified elsewhere. Hence we can rely only upon the general dating furnished by Sir Aurel Stein's explorations, which attribute the forts at Mīrān, Endere, and Mazār Tāgh to the eighth century A.D. The general probability that Mīrān is the earliest is reinforced by the date (A.D. 717) of a Chinese coin found there; while similar, but more abundant, finds assign the occupation of Mazār Tāgh to the latter half of the century.

It is a curious fact that the Mīrān documents, numerous as they are, never refer to Śiṅ-śan, while those from Śiṅ-śan, although mentioning, not infrequently, places in the eastern parts of Chinese Turkestan, do not name Ka-dag, or Nob, or—recognizably—Endere or Mīrān. This may be partly due to the fact that the documents, in spite of their number, are probably in each case collections covering comparatively short periods. The failure of mention of identical *persons* is, however, somewhat notable, and we may

regard it as due to difference of period, so that the Mīrān collections would belong to the first half of the eighth century, and be thus at least one generation prior to those from Mazār Tāgh. We cannot suppose that such records as we have, relating, as they do, to passing matters, would be preserved in the local archives over any considerable period of years.

9. M.I., iv, 71 (wood, c. 19.5 × cm., complete ; ll. 2 *recto* + 3 *verso* of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can*, script ; hole for string at right).

[A 1] ꠸ || ya.la.mchis.paḫi.rje[s].la.slar.mchis.pas.non.te.lam.po.cher.žugste.sla[r] [A 2] mchis | Dru.gu.sña.ma.Dro.dgorsu.btab.paḫi.braṅ.sa.brtags.naḫ | braṅ.rdal.lña [B 1] tsam.mchiste | rta.sna.rol.gchig.bkum.nas || stsaṅ.śa.dag.kyaṅ.bsregste(°to ?).ḫtshal.[B 2] braṅ.naḫ.gla.dar.gchig.daṅ.gri.śubs.gchig.kyaṅ.rñede | Cha.mdoḫi.Be-ti (°to ? Ce.ni ?).steṅ.du.gdar.[B3]bcug.ste.[pyad ? bya l ?].daṅ.khram.bu.bžag.ste.ces | gñer.Ḫglems.gsol.ba.lags.

[A 1–B 1] " Returning after going to the up-country, and with effort reaching the high road, we came back. Having observed a Dru-gu station previously established at Dro-dgors, some five scattered houses, and having killed a horse outpost, we set to work burning the corn and flesh (*or* station, if we read *braṅ.sa* in place of *stsaṅ.śa*). [B 2–3] In the dwellings we found a banner and a sabre-sheath. Being appointed to be up in Be-ti (°to ? Ce-ni ?) of Cha-mdo, we have left the articles (*byad* ?), and a schedule (*khram-bu* ?). Petition of store-keeper Ḫglems."

Notes

A. 2, *Dro-dgors* : Unknown.

braṅ-sa : " station " or " halting-place ". This expression is common in the names of stopping-places in the mountains, e.g. Saser Braṅ-sa on the Karakoram route.

B. 2, *stsaṅ-śa* : If not a miswriting for *braṅ-śa*, would mean " the store of corn and (dried) meat ". Be-ti (°to ? Ce-ni ?) is not known.

10. M.I. xxiii, 009 (paper, fol. no. 63 in vol.; c. 28.5 × 6 cm.; nearly complete; obscure: ll. 6 *recto* + 6 *verso* (a different hand) of ordinary *dbu-can* script).

[A] 1 . | glaṅ.gi.loḫi.dpyid.|| blon.Btsan.Sug.bžer.daṅ | blon.[Giṅ.z]igs.daṅ | blon.Dpal.bzaṅ.la.stsogs.las | | ḫdun .sa.[*Dru*].gur. [A2] . . [*Dr*]u.gu.yul.du.myi.ḫdzin.cha. gsum.[bkye[1]].baḫi.rta.pa.cha.gcigi . dpuṅ . pon . pa | tsa. rṅu.Khoṅ.rgid.btus.pas | ḫtshal.bahi.g-yar.ḫog.rta . . [3] ma.ḫbyor.nas: | | rlaṅ.Ḫbrug.legs.kyi.rta.phros.pa.glaste| gla.[*rgod.po.cuṅ.phyugs* (*stsus* ?)] .pa . gcig.yanu . sbdus.so. ri[*ba.mtha.ral ma* m-chis la] . . [4] [sgur.daṅ.sgrad.]maṃ-chis | sraṅ.drug.ri.ba.gcig.stsal.par.bgyis.pa.daṅ || rta.pho. naṅ.pa.dṅos.gum.stor.ma.gyur.te | slan.[chad.m] . . [5] na.yaṅ.[skad].rmyig.[l]as.skyon.žug.ste.bkol.spyad.ltam gnod.*par*.gyur.ḫam.khoṅ.gcoṅ.žugs.na. || Śi.[ṅ]ir.gi.ri . . [6] sum.cur.b[tab] ste. | rta.pho.rgod.gaṅ.ḫbyor.ḫbyor.... gcig . . . . . is. [*ba.mtha.bži*] . . .

[A 1] "Spring of the Ox year; from Councillor Btsan-sug (sum ?)-bžer and Councillor Giṅ-zigs and Councillor Dpal-bzaṅ and others. Assemblage in [Dru]-gu . . . [A 2–3] The *tsa-rṅu* Khoṅ-rgid having been attached as commander of a horse-company belonging to three companies to be dispatched into the Dru-gu country to take prisoners (*myi-ḫdzin*), the requisite horse was not available, high or low (*g-yar-ḫog*). He having hired a spare horse of *rlaṅ* Ḫbrug-legs, the hire (*here follow some particulars which cannot be clearly read*) . . . [A 4–6] it was arranged that he should give six *sraṅ* as one [part of the] price. The tame stallion not having died or been lost and afterwards being found faulty in voice or hoofs or injured . . . or with a cough it was left at the Śi-ṅir hill, at Sum-cu: whatever untamed stallion is available . . . one . . ."

Notes

l. A. 3, *phros-pa*: "Additional," "remaining."

gla as a verb is not found elsewhere. The following passage no doubt stated the price.

[1] bgyi ?

A. 4, *naṅ-pa* (*ṅaṅ-pa* ?) : "Domestic" (i.e. tame ?), is apparently contrasted with the *rgod* "wild" (i.e. "not broken in" ?), of l. 6.

A. 5, *bkol-spyad-ltam* : The sense is uncertain : *bkol-spyod* has the sense of "boiling".

Śi-ṅir : On this place-name see *infra*, p. 825.

Sum-cur : This means "at thirty" ; but it seems likely that a place-name is intended, and this might be *Sum-chu* "Three Waters", since in the Chronicle we have such a place-name (ll. 5, 35 : 'Sum-chu-bo in Śaṅs"), though the place may not be the same.

The Great and Little Dru-gu, and the Upper Dru-gu

In connection with the Ḫa-ża (*JRAS.*, 1927, p. 80) and with Śa-cu (ibid., p. 808), we have already met with the name *Drug-cun*, which may have been understood to mean the "Little Dru-gu" (*Drug-chuṅ*). Further examples are the following :—

11. M.I. iv, 57 (*a*) (paper fragment, fol. no. 19 in vol. ; c. 6 × 6 cm. ; parts of ll. 4 of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script ; similar to Ch. 56, 51).

[1] . . . [mtshams.tho.rgya] . . . [2] . . . ḫi.su.tug || nub.ma . . . [3] . . . [mtsh]ams.tho.rgya.can.la.thug . . . [4] . . . *m*thoṅ.khyab.Drug.cun.gyi . . . [5] . . . -i . . [l]ags . . .

". . . boundary-stone mark . . . came upon. West . . . came upon a boundary-stone with a mark . . . watch-tower, of the Drug-cun . . ."

Notes

l. 1, *mthsams-tho* : The expression is frequent in another document.

l. 4, *mthoṅ-khyab* : On this expression see *JRAS.*, 1928, p. 559.

12. M.I. iv, 57 (*a*) (paper fragment, fol. 19 in vol. ; c. 4 × 10·5 cm., discoloured ; parts of ll. 6 of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script ; similar to Ch. 56, 51).

[1] . . . gyi (gi | ?) | byaṅ.m . . .
[2] . . . gi.mtshams . . .
[3] . . . [g] | $\frac{oo}{oo}$ | | rtse.h̤-(l-?) . . .
[4] . . . || lho.dag.kʌṅ (śod ? śor ?) . . .
[5] . . . [tsh]aṅ.stod . . .
(*A line is perhaps lost here.*)
[6] . . . -un.gyi.rje.žiṅ . . .
[7] -i . .-o

" . . . north . . . boundary of . . . Rtse-[*h̤thoṅ* ?] . . . South . . . Upper [*Rgod* (?)-tsh]aṅ . . . king's land of the [*Drug-c*]un . . ."

On *rje-žiṅ*, see *JRAS.*, 1928, pp. 562, 564, 570.

That the expression *Drug-cun* was understood by the Tibetans to mean " Little Dru-gu " is clear from the mention of the " Great Dru-gu ", which is exemplified in—

13. M.I., iv, 81 (wood, c. 10 × 2.5 cm., fragmentary at right and left; ll. 2 *recto* + 2 *verso* of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script, rather obscure).

[A 1] . . . Ldoṅ.bzaṅ.Lha.sgra.[gsas].kyi.gžis . . .
[A 2] . . . s.kyis | stod.gyi.Dru.gu.dma[g] . . .
[B 1] . . . gñan . . [*g*]y-h̤ . . .
[B 2] . . . [bla.Drug.]che.chu[ṅ].gi.[sts] . . .

[A 1] ". . . estate of Ldoṅ-bzaṅ Lha-sgra-gsas . . .
[A 2] . . . army of the upper Dru-gu . . .
[B] . . . [*crop*] of the Great and Little Drug . . ."

This document is evidently connected with M.I, iv, 49 (printed in *JRAS.*, 1928, p. 559), where the same Ldoṅ-bzaṅ Lha-sgra-gsas is mentioned in connection with the Upper Dru-gu (and with Tshal-byi).

We have found the " Little Dru-gu " associated with the H̤a-ža, Śa-cu, Kva-cu, Stoṅ-sar. The " Upper Dru-gu " are in the above passage associated with the " Great " and the " Little ", and in iv, 49 with Tshal-byi, which we have seen reason (*JRAS.*, 1928, p. 561) to regard as being the mountainous hinterland of Cer-cen.

The " Great Dru-gu " will recur in a passage to be quoted below (p. 819).

F.K. 1024 (Kha. 140, paper) merely states that a Tibetan donkey and a Dru-gu donkey are alike. In all the remaining occurrences (M. Tāgh. 0022, 0147, 0558, i. 0016, *a*, vi, 0031, *b*. ii, 0023) we have on wooden tablets merely the expression *Dru-gu-ḫjor*, except that in one ot them (0022) the place-name *Tseḫu.ca*[*g*] (*JRAS.*, 1930, p. 282) is appended.

The Dru-gu cor *and the Bug* cor

The word *cor* has been equated (*JRAS.*, 1927, p. 68) to the Chinese *tch'ouo* (*chur*), noted by Chavannes (*Documents sur les Tou-kiue Occidentaux*, s. Index) as applied to certain five subdivisions of the Turkish tribes and also the persons at the head of them. There can be, I imagine, little doubt that the term is identical with the Turkish *cur*, which Thomsen found (*Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, p. 155) in similar double employment. We might conveniently use " Count " and " County " as equivalent thereto.

The Dru-gu *cor* itself has been mentioned above (*JRAS.*, 1927, p. 68; 1930, pp. 56, 84). In the form *Dru-gu-ḫjor* it has occurred, ibid., 1930, p. 85, and this is seen also in :—

14. M. Tāgh. *a*, vi, 0031 (wood, c. 12 × 2 cm.; l. 1 of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script : about 12 notches).

𑖀 | : | Drugu.ḫjor |

and in the documents mentioned above. We have also a parallel in *Khri-skugs-ḫjor* (1930, p. 259). Since the words on the wooden tablets are very often merely the names of places for which the objects accompanying them were kept or destined, there can be no doubt that here also the meaning is " the Dru-gu county ", " the Khri-skugs county ". A probably erroneous variant *Dru-gu-ḫjon* is found in one instance, viz.—

15. M. Tāgh. c. iii, 0043 (wood, c. 11 × 2 cm., complete ; ll. 2 *recto* + 2 *verso* of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script).

[A 1] 𑖀 | : | Rgya.Sluṅs.yan.chad.daṅ.Dru.gu.ḫjon.

(man) [A 2] man.chad.kyi.phur.myi.stag.rnams.laḫ | [B 1] Lhaḫ.mthoṅ.gi.gsol.bā.sgya.ḫu.naḫdi.thugs.pag. [B 2] cig.nas.chig.du.mjed.par.gsol.žiṅ.mchi.

"To the soldier officers (or swordsmen (?), *phur-myi*) up to Chinese Sluṅs and down to the Dru-gu-ḫjon; request of Lhaḫ(Lha)-mthoṅ. He requests that these things in the bag (*sgya-ḫu-naḫdi* ?) be conveyed (*mjed* ?) with care on from one to another."

If this Lha-mthoṅ is the *žaṅ-khri* Lha-mthoṅ named in the Lha-sa Pillar inscription (*JRAS.*, 1911, p. 43) of A.D. 783 or 822, his "request" is a polite command. On Chinese Sluṅs and *phur-myi* see *supra*, 1927, p. 820 n.; 1930, pp. 55, 258.

In the passage last cited, and also in that given *supra* (1930, pp. 84–5), there is a question of missives to Śiṅ-śan by routes which reach down to the Dru-gu *cor* from the Tibetan highlands. The places mentioned in the same connection are Par-ban, probably in the region of Polu or Cer-cen (p. 264), and Chinese Sluṅs, probably in the mountains further east: elsewhere also Dru-gu are connected with (the mountain hinterland of) Tshal-byi and with the Ḫa-ža, who have the same relationship.

It seems to follow from these considerations that the "Dru-gu county" or province, was, under the Tibetan administration, simply the "Nob region" or the old Shan-shan kingdom, for which the documents supply no other designation. That the term was not unreasonably applied we may judge from the statement of the Chinese pilgrim Sung-yun (A.D. 518, Chavannes, p. 390) that—

"The kings who had been designated by that city [Shan-shan], have been conquered by the Tu-yü-hun: at present the sovereign in that city is the second son (of the king) of the Tu-yü-hun: (he has the title of pacifyer of the west, and commands 3,000 men, who are employed in withstanding the western Hu" (the people of Khotan).

We have other proofs that, prior to the coming of the

Turks and Tibetans, the Tu-yü-hun were rather powerful; and it is to be presumed that, under Chinese suzerainty, they remained in possession of Shan-shan, until overthrown by the Tibetans. The latter would therefore, if the Dru-gu were Tu-yü-hun, have had good reason for styling that kingdom the Dru-gu *cor*. This would also account for the rather frequent association of the Dru-gu with the Ḫa-ża, if the Ḫa-ża were, as we have reason for believing, the people of Shan-shan, and its hinterland. We may also remark that the name *Mu-li-yen*, attributed by the Chinese to the Tu-yü-hun king who invaded Khotan, has some resemblance to *Mug-lden*, which at a later date (c. A.D. 640) we have found in a Ḫa-ża connection (1927, pp. 61 sqq.).

It is, however, the Drug-cun who are in the documents most clearly brought into connection with the Ḫa-ża; and this name, which rhymes somewhat obviously with Tu-yü[k]-hun, suggests that the Great Dru-gu, who are placed in antithesis to the Drug-cun, may be found elsewhere.

What then of the Bug *cor*? This is mentioned in the Tibetan Chronicle (l. 162), but only to say that in an Ape year (A.D. 719) an emissary came thence to present submission (*phyag-ḫtsald*): the context is uninstructive. There exists, however, a document which supplies more definite information. It contains an account (fragmentary) of the bad and better ages of human history.

16. Ch. 73, xv, 4 (vol. 56, fol. 35, a paper fragment, c. 25 × 46 cm., rather worn at left and right edges, yellowish; l. 51 of cursive, *dbu-can* script, a small hand, obscure, and with some gaps due to holes in the paper).

The first forty-four lines are without historical attachments. On line 45 begins the following passage, which continues to the end of the MS. :—

[45] . . . || ḫuṅ.nas.bar.ḫdiḫi.tshe.ni.spu[1].skyin.daṅ.ḫbab.paḫi.tshe.yin.no || ḫuṅ.nas.skyin.daṅ.ḫbab.paḫi: [46] [dus.lo].sum.brgyaḫ.drug.cu.las.das(?).daṅ || Rgyaḫ.yul.gyi.

[1] Crossed out.

ḫog || mtshoḫ.chen.po.žigi.pha.rol.nas.rgyal.po.gdoṅ.nag.po.śiṅ.rta [47] nag.po.žon.ba.žig.lo.drug.cuḫi.bar.du dar.te | Rgya.mgo.nag.po.de.la.phyag.tshal.žiṅ.des.bkol.bar.ḫoṅ.ṅoḫ | rgyal.po.deḫi [48] tshe.lo.drug.cu.ḫdaḫ.nas || Bug.chor.gyi.rgya.sa.ḫdam.baḫi.khuṅ.bu.nas.byuṅ.ste || myi(myiṅ ?).ni.ḫdi.Drug.chen.po.žes.bya.baḫs || [49] Rgyaḫi.rgyal.po.gdoṅ.nag.po.daṅ. | Bug.chor.gyi.rgyal.po.gñis | myed.par.byas.te.Rgya.daṅ.Bug.chor.gñis | ḫbaṅs.rgyal.po [50] des.bkol.žiṅ.dphyaḫ.ḫjal.bar.ḫoṅ.ṅo || Drug.chen.poḫi.rgyal.pos.lo.bdun.cu.rtsa.gñis.dar.toḫ | lo.bdun.cu.rtsa.gñis . [51] dar.pa.daṅ. | ñi.ma.śar.logs.kyi.Dru.gu.daṅ | ñi.ma.nub.pa.logs.gyi.Dru.gu.gñis.ḫthabste | thog.ma.ni.nub.phyogs.kyi.Drugu . . .

" Next the present period is the period of loans and taxes. When of this period three hundred and sixty years had passed, there came from a land on the far side of a great lake below (*sc.* west of) the country of China, a black-face king, riding in a black chariot, who flourished during sixty years. China did homage to that black-head and was subjugated by him. When of that king's time sixty years had passed, there arose from a small cave in the Chinese swamp country of the Bug *chor* a man called the Great Drug, who annihilated both the black-face king of China and the king of the Bug *chor*; the people of both China and the Bug *chor* were subjugated by that king and paid taxes. The Great Drug king flourished during seventy-two years. After he had flourished seventy-two-years the Dru-gu of the East and the Dru-gu of the West fought. At first the Dru-gu of the West . . ."

In this document, which comes from the hidden library of the Ch'ien-fo-tung and is therefore probably not later than the tenth century A.D., it seems as if the " Great Drug ", who came from the Chinese swamp country of the Bug *chor*, no doubt the Lop-nor region, should be of Turkish stock. Following a " black-face " king, who might be a Tibetan (though these are usually ' Red-Face '), he could not be a Hiung-nu or a Juan-Juan. The division into

" Dru-gu of the East " and " Dru-gu of the West " is hardly decisive, since not only the division of the Turks into northern and western (which was also eastern and western), but also an earlier division of the Juan-Juan on the same lines (Cordier, *Histoire de la Chine*, i, p. 351), and the division of Anterior and Posterior Chü-shih, i.e. Turfan and Guchen (Stein, *Innermost Asia*, pp. 566 sqq.), might come into question. If the Turks are meant, the division might be either that into North and West, A.D. 582 (Chavannes, *Documents Chinois*, pp. 259 sqq.), or that into the five tribes Tu-lu and the five tribes Nu-she-pi, c. A.D. 630 (ibid., pp. 265 sqq.) : in the former case the periods of 60 years and 72 years, which numbers are likely to be correct, would correspond respectively to A.D. 450–510 and 510–82 ; in the latter case to A.D. 498–558 and A.D. 558–630. Both are out of the question, in case the Tibetans are to precede. Hence the probabilities may be in favour of the Uigurs, who about A.D. 850 did succeed the Tibetans in the mastery of Kan-su and who also underwent a process of division (see Klaproth, *Sprache und Schrift der Uigur*, pp. 33–4). But these are rather questions for Sinologists and Turkologists, who may be able to decide whether the particulars stated are reconcilable with what is otherwise known. The legendary character of the narrative renders it inadvisable to pursue the matter here.

The Bug *cor*, however, " the Chinese swamp country," being clearly in the Lop-nor region, is, no doubt, identical with Kan-su, and perhaps *bug* = pug, attested (*JRAS.*, 1927, p. 299) as an old form of *pei* " north ". The native *people* of the Śa-cu country seem to have been named *Ḥbrug* " Dragon ", a term which we have recorded several times (*JRAS.*, 1927, pp. 67–8 ; 1928, p. 583).

It would seem, therefore, that we have evidence for the existence of two adjacent provinces, named respectively the *Drug-cor* and the *Bug-cor*, one of which we have identified with the old Shan-shan kingdom, while the other is Kan-su and probably includes the Śa-cu region as far west as Lop-nor.

Other References to the Dru-gu (Gru-gu)

In Tibetan literature generally the Dru-gu are practically unknown, and their name is not to be found in the dictionaries. Once or twice in documents from the hidden library of Chi'en-fo-tung the name of this people is mentioned, as is also that of the Ḥa-ża; but the passages are uninformative. The same may be said of the references which we have previously cited from documents; in one document, however, from the Śa-cu region (1928, p. 583) a Dru-gu man is mentioned along with a Ḥbrug, while in another (of the eighth century A.D., 1928, pp. 78 sqq.) the Drug are named, along with the Chinese and the Ḥjaṅ, as having been at war with the Tibetans.

As a representative people of the *north* the Dru-gu are mentioned as early as the Lha-sa Pillar inscription of A.D. 783 or 822 (edited by Colonel Waddell in *JRAS.*, 1909; see pp. 930, 948), where the four directions are represented by the Chinese (east), Nepal (south), Tibet (west), and the Drug (north). A like ascription of the Gru-gu (Dru-gu) to the north is to be found in a passage discussed *infra* (p. 828), derived from a literary notice of the Tibetan king Mu-tig-btsan-po (c. A.D. 800). The Bon literature, which in principle is fairly old, retains a souvenir of the Dru-gu people, and in fact locates them with some exactitude. Thus we are told that a range of mountains called Ba-dag-śan (Badakshan) separates the Gru-gu from the Tsha-gser people (perhaps identical with the Rgya-ser people conquered by Cingis Khan in his Sarikkol expedition of A.D. 1194; see Huth, *Hor-chos-byuṅ*, p. 23) on the south, while another range, named Śaṅ-la-nag-po, separates them from the Turks (*Hor*).

Conclusion

It might be thought that the citations contained in the last paragraph are decisive in favour of an identification of the Dru-gu with the Uigurs, who about the end of the eighth century A.D. became a great power in the regions north of Chinese Turkestan: and we might suppose that, while the Turks generally are designated *Hor*, the Uigur Turks are

distinguished by the special appellation *Dru-gu*. Who else, in fact, are the Dru-gu to be, seeing that they cannot possibly be Hiung-nu, Juan-Juan (Ephthalites), or Mongols? Since, however, the former impossibility, based upon dates (for the Tibetans are fighting the Dru-gu as early as A.D. 675—not to mention the far earlier Dru-gu episodes in Khotan history), still stands fast, it is clear that there must be some way of escape from conflicting alternatives. A closer examination may help to discover such an expedient.

Starting with the fact that Gu-zan was in the Dru-gu country, we shall note first that this place must be the same in all the passages where it is named. The well-known passage in the Annals of Khotan, which states that the king of Gu-zan, and the king of Kanika and king Vijaya-Kīrti of Khotan made a joint expedition to India cannot be separated from the rest: for it was written in the eleventh century A.D., at which time the people of Chinese Turkestan and Tibet must have known quite definitely what they meant by the name Gu-zan, even if the statement which they made concerning a past event was contrary to fact. When, in the eighth century (c. A.D. 745), we hear of the Chinese being invited to come into Khotan and Gu-zan, the region meant must be the same as when, in A.D. 687, the Tibetan army marches to Gu-zan in the Dru-gu country.

The name *Gu-zan* is highly suggestive of Guchen. Situated to the north of the Bogdo-Ulā mountains, the most easterly extension of the Tien-shan, with Barkul to the east, Hami and Pi-chan beyond the range to the south, and the Turfan depression beyond another range to the west, it was the capital of what the Chinese designated Posterior Chü-shih, Anterior Chü-shih being Turfan itself. From the excellent account which Sir Aurel Stein has given of this region,[1] which is separated from Mongolia by the Dzungarian plateau and the

[1] *Innermost Asia*, pp. 566–86. For authorities see Klaproth, *Sprache und Schrift der Uigur*, pp. 44 sqq.; Chavannes, *T'oung-Pao*, 1907, pp. 210 sqq.; O. Franke, *Eine chinesische Tempelinschrift aus Idikutšahri bei Turfan* (Berlin Academy *Abhandlungen*, 1907), pp. 7 sqq.

Altai mountains, we see that, though subject to the dominion of the successive great kingdoms to the north, the Hiung-nu, the Juan-Juan, the Turks, as well as to the Chinese, it had a continuous internal history, until it became absorbed in the kingdom of the Uigurs, with its capital at Karakoram. Sir Aurel Stein remarks upon " the close intercourse which, since ancient times, must have existed between Anterior and Posterior Chü-shih, i.e. Turfān and the present Guchen region "(p. 554), and manifests a lively recognition of a difference between the character of the population, which must be of highly mixed descent, and that of their northern neighbours beyond Dzungaria, the true Turks and Mongols from the Altai (pp. 550, 558). As regards the presence of Tibetans in this region, he reminds us that " We know that in A.D. 670 the ' Four Garrisons ' controlled by the Protectorate of An-hsi (Kuchā, Khotan, Kāshgar, Tokmak) were overrun by the Tibetans, who had in that year won a signal victory over the imperial forces north of the Kuku-nor, and that, notwithstanding the successes won by certain Chinese generals in 673 and 677–9, a Chinese supremacy in these regions was not re-established until 692. It seems difficult to believe that the Tibetans, who had then risen to formidable power, should have conquered the Tārīm basin and made their influence felt even north of the T'ien-shan, without having at least temporarily secured mastery over the oases from Tun-huang to Turfān, through which led the least difficult line of access to the former " (pp. 579–80). After its re-establishment, the Chinese authority was maintained, precariously after A.D. 766, with the aid of the Uigurs, until 790, when " the people of Pei-t'ing, tired of Uigur exactions, submitted to the Tibetans, together with the Sha-t'o tribe, a branch of the Turkish Ch'u-yueh, who appear, as early as the first T'ang advance to Hāmi and Turfān, in semi-nomadic occupation of the Guchen region . . . Towards the close of 790 a fresh effort was made by the Uigurs to retake Pei-t'ing, but led to their signal defeat . . . The complete predominance which the

Tibetans appear to have gained in Eastern Turkestān during the early part of the ninth century accounts for the absence of further references to Turfān in the Chinese records for this period. But, soon after the middle of that century, Tibetan supremacy in that region and in westernmost Kan-su was broken by the Uigurs, whom Kirghiz attacks and internal dissensions had forced to move from their former seats in Mongolia to the south and south-west" (ibid., p. 581).

This history renders it highly probable that the Tibetan general who in the year A.D. 687 marched to Gu-zan in the Dru-gu country was really operating in the direction of Guchen. As regards the actual name, which in its Chinese form *Ku-ch'êng-tzŭ* means the "ancient town" (Stein, op. cit., p. 554), it seems possible that it has been adapted by the Chinese in order to provide it with a meaning. But there are other possibilities. Thus we have the pass Ku-chüan, which Sir A. Stein crossed on his way from Guchen to Turfan (ibid., p. 555). Further, the town of Pei-t'ing, which later appears in Turkish as Bēshbaliq "the five towns", was originally known to the Chinese by the same expression, which in its then Chinese form would have had the pronunciation **Gu-ẓiang*; and this also may perhaps be an interpretation of a native *Gu-zan*. These alternatives—and it may be added that vice versa *Gu-zan* might be a representation of the Chinese *Ku-ch'êng* or *Gu-ẓiang*—may seem not to strengthen the arguments from nomenclature connecting Gu-zan with the Guchen-Turfan region. But they do not weaken it: until a preferable alternative is found, the attribution of Gu-zan to the Guchen region retains its philological probability.

This probability would be enhanced if we could find in the same general region place-names identifiable with some of those which have occurred in our extracts. These are Dro-dgors, Ltaṅ-yor, Khri-bśos, Śoṅ-sna, Śi-ṅir, and Draṅ. The first named is not stated to be, though it must be agreed that it probably was, in the Dru-gu country. Ltaṅ-yor seems rather suggestive of north-eastern Tibet—

for the syllable *yor*, which recurs in the name of Gtse-nam-yor in Mdo-smad, may be a word of that region, meaning "cairn" or "boundary mark" of stones: this, however, is indecisive, since the syllable may be a Tibetan addition to the names, or may be of non-Tibetan origin, or the name in its entirety may have been bestowed by the Tibetans. But Śoṅ-sna, where the General Khri-ḫbriṅ, returning from Draṅ, in the Dru-gu country, and "lingering outside" (sc. of Tibet), held the "summer assemblage", might very well be in the Shonā-nor depression, between Hami or Pichan and the Quruk-tāgh mountains. Also the Śi-ṅir mountain, mentioned in the document M.I. xxiii, 009 (*supra*, p. 813), in connection with the Dru-gu country, is likely to be the "Sinir-tag" of Andree's Attas, and in fact to be the "mountain of Singer",[1] which lies north of the western part of the Quruk-tāgh and may have been on a route from the Lop-nor district to Guchen, Pichan, and Turfān. That in all times there was regular communication between Lop-nor-Shan-shan and the Guchen-Turfān country is patent from the historical particulars cited by Chavannes and Sir A. Stein, as well as in other ways.[2] If these identifications are sound, then quite possibly Draṅ may be Taranchi, which Sir A. Stein's map places south of the Bogdo-Ulā mountains. Taranchi is, no doubt, simply Turkish *taranchi* "land-cultivator", where the *chi* is the common suffix (Vamberg, *Kudatku Bilik*, pp. 5, 232. To a Turkish local name there can be no objection, since the country had known a Turkish overlordship during a long period commencing about a century previously. Lastly, Khri-bśos was probably identical with the lake Khri- śo, which, according to a Bon book, lies between the kingdom of Ge-sar and Tibet. This is, perhaps, the lake

[1] For the frequency of mountain names meaning merely the "mountain of such and such a place" (and the same applies no doubt, to other large natural features), see Conway, *Climbing in the Karakoram*, pp. 172, 297.

[2] In the passage quoted from the Chinese by Bushell in *JRAS.*, 1882, p. 454, the Tibetan king speaks of "one desert only, which horsemen can canter across in ten days", as the best approach to this region from Tibetan territory.

Bagrash (unless it is the Khri-bśor, or Koko-nor as seems to be indicated by the Tibetan Geography translated by Wassiliew (St. Petersburg, 1895, p. 55)); and *Khri-bśos-khrom*, "the Khri-bśos city," will be either Karashahr or Korla or some other place in the region of that lake.

The identification of the Dru-gu country with the Guchen-Turfān region seems, therefore, highly acceptable; and, since the region at the period in question was still under Chinese government and did not pass into the hands of the Uigurs until the middle of the ninth century, we have a further chronological proof that the original application of the name Dru-gu was not to the Uigurs. That at a later time, when the Uigurs became dominant in the region, the term was perhaps applied to them by the Tibetans creates no difficulty. In nomadic or semi-nomadic Asia the ethnic names seem to have two alternative destinies; either they cleave to the people who originally bore them, in which case they wander (e.g. Tokhari, Turk, Mughal) over the map; or they become attached to a district (e.g. Tokharistan, Turkestan) and so apply during different periods to different successive populations. The Tibetans, who in Chinese Turkestan appeared late, probably derived the term *Dru-gu* from the people of Shan-shan and Khotan. Originally it may have denoted not only the people of the Guchen-Turfan area, but generally the less civilized tribes of the whole Tien-shan region, including the "Wu-sun" of the Chinese. Possibly the name may have come to Khotan, along with some other impressions, from the Iranian sphere and may be ultimately identical with the *druj* or the Sanskrit *Druh-yu*, meaning, perhaps, originally "deceitful", "hated", "foreign", "barbarous", and applied to a people on the north-west of India. The Drug-cun, interpreted as the "Little Drug-gu", may have been originally the "Cun Dru-gu". Whether this name can be equated in part to that of the Tu-yü[k]-hun (stated to be the name of one of the early kings), I must leave to others to determine; but it certainly seems likely that it

was applied by the Tibetans to "Dru-gu" connected with the Ḥa-ża country, which seems to be the Drug *cor*, originally Shan-shan. The relation of the name *Dru-gu* to that of the Turks, with which Professor Pelliot has reasonably connected it (*J.A.*, 1914, ii, p. 144), remains somewhat obscure: *Türk* is said to have been a *helmet*-shaped mountain. Is it certain that the Chinese *Tu-kine* does not represent *Dru(Dur)-gu* rather than *Türk*?

The Dru-gu and Ge-sar

In this connection it is impossible to avoid a reference to that most widely spread and most wonderful popular Epic legend of Central and Eastern Asia, the Ge-sar story, first made known in Europe by I. J. Schmidt's translation from the Mongol under the title *Die Thaten Bogda Gesser Chans* (St. Petersburg, 1839). Besides being familiar to the Chinese and Manchus, it exists also in a Tibetan oral tradition, partly made known in published editions and translations by the late Dr. A. H. Francke, who has also edited a Western Tibetan (oral) version in full; a Burushaski, also oral, form of it is being communicated by Colonel D. L. R. Lorimer. We have previously (*Festgabe Hermann Jacobi*, p. 65) had occasion to remark that a non-legendary Phrom Ge-sar is named in the Khotan Annals; and a similar observation was made by E. Schlagintweit concerning the (otherwise uninformative) references to Ge-sar in the Life of Padmasambhava (p. 522 of *Die Lebensbeschreibung von Padma Sambhava* in the Munich Academy *Abhandlungen*, 1903). But we do not realize the significance of this fact, until we reflect that such a reference carries back the question of Ge-sar and his story to a date far anterior to our other knowledge of it. Even if we ignore the date of the Khotan king[1] who is stated to have married a daughter of Phrom Ge-sar, the actual statement in the Annals is not later than the eleventh century. In fact, however, we have an earlier Tibetan text which identifies the kingdom of Ge-sar with

[1] *Ancient Khotan*, p. 580.

the Gru-gu (= Dru-gu). This is an account in verse, from the nature of its contents obviously quite early, of the achievements of the Tibetan king Mu-tig-btsan-po (c. 800), son of Khri-sroṅ-ldeḫu-btsan; it occurs in the *Rgyal-poḫi-bkaḫi-thaṅ-yig* "Pronouncements concerning kings", being the second part of the *Padma-[byuṅ-gnas]-bkaḫi-thaṅ-yig*, the well-known "Pronouncements of Padma[sambhava]", a work of probably the tenth century A.D.; and it is quoted at length in the introductory Index volume to the Snar-thaṅ edition of the Bkaḫ-ḫgyur (fol. 14*a* 7, sqq.), where the lines read as follows (fol. 22*a* of the Padma xylograph shows small variants):—

17. byaṅ.phyogs.Ge.sar.Gru.gu.bžugs.pa.yaṅ ꞏ
bar.du.bkaḫ.ḫkhon.byuṅ.nas.bsdo.ba.la ꞏ
srin.po.Gdoṅ.dmar.Bod.kyi.dmag.g-yos.nas ꞏ
Gru.gu.yul.gyi.'Oṅ.du.yan.chod.la ꞏ
Bod.kyi.dmag.dpuṅ.sbra.nag.phab.nas.ni ꞏ
yul.brlag.mi.rnams.Mon.gyi.sa.la.bskyal ꞏ
khyim.mkhar.Mon.gyi.sa.la.btoṅ(d ?).nas.kyaṅ ꞏ
yul.du.mi.ṅan.bsten.pa.sun.phyuṅ.ste ꞏ
spa.bkoṅ.ded.dpon.yul.ḫ(m)khar.ḫtsho.bar.bžag ꞏ
Gru.gu.Ge.sar.Bod.kyi.bran.du.phyag ꞏ

"The Gru-gu Ge-sar, residing in the northern quarter, having until then in resentment at commands, shown rivalry, the demon Red-Face army of Tibet was sent in motion. As far as 'Oṅ-du in the Gru-gu kingdom the army forces of Tibet set up the black tents and escorted the people, divorced from their land, into the Mon territory. Though given a home town in Mon territory,[1] they were discontented, relying upon evil men in the country. A terrifying leader (*ded-dpon* = *sārthavāha*) being posted to garrison the country, the Gru-gu Ge-sar gave his submission as a servant of Tibet."

[1] i.e. among the Mons, a non-Tibetan people, usually associated with the western parts of Tibet and the lower Himalaya. See the dictionaries, and also Schiefner, *Eine tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Çâkjamunis*, p. 328; Laufer, *Klu° Bum bsdus pai sñiṅ po*, pp. 94 sqq.; A. H. Francke, *Antiquities of Western Tibet*, vol. i (index).

From this extract it will be seen that the passage, which is being edited entire elsewhere, contains particulars of much verisimilitude concerning the king Mu-tig-btsan-po, the patron of Padmasambhava, far different from the meagre notices in later works such as the *Rgyal-rabs*.

The association of Ge-sar with the country of the Dru-gu is not a casual idea of the panegyrist of Mu-tig-btsan-po. It is current in the Bon literature, where the kingdom of Ge-sar is regarded as being in the north and separated from Tibet and from China by sand-deserts. In spite of the schematistic and fanciful features which appear in the geographical notions it is clear that the Tibetans generally place the realm of Gesar precisely where we have found the Dru-gu. We shall, therefore, reject the statement on p. 224 of Sarat Candra Das' Tibetan Dictionary that Ge-sar was "a powerful king ruling in Shensi in China. . . . According to some authors he lived in the seventh century A.D." in favour of his other statement (p. 845) that "*Phrom* is the name of a country situated to the north-east of Yarkand and north of Tibet. . . . This country in the sixth century A.D. is said to have been under the rule of king Gesar".

It would be inadvisable to lay any stress upon any part of the personal nomenclature of the Ge-sar story, since this varies in the different versions. But the general lines of the story, a journey to the east on a friendly visit to China, a journey to the north into the country of the Turks, a combat with the "Tangut" chiefs, who are in alliance with the king of Khotan, are not inconsistent with such a geographical situation as we have conceived. Moreover, the subjects are in part such as accord with the period which we have in view, say from A.D. 500–800: more especially the question of a Chinese wife, a matter of international rivalry in at least the earlier part of the period, seems significant in regard to the original historical setting of the legend. More generally still, we have in the fall of the old civilizations of Kucā and Turfan, overwhelmed by the comparative barbarism of the

northern hordes, the same favourable ground for the growth of a popular epic, based upon uncomprehended reminiscences, which exists in the cases of the legends of Priam, Brutus, and Arthur.

However this may be, the meaning of the expression Phrom Ge-sar "Gesar of the City" seems certain. For the alternative form *khrom* has in Tibetan regularly the meaning of "mart" or "town"; and in the Central Asian documents we have frequently found it in such expressions as *Sta-gu-khrom, khrom-Nob-ched-po, khrom Kva-cu Si-ṅan*; in the year 741–2 the Tibetans, after capturing the Chinese city *Dar-khva-hvyan*, inflicted in Žaṅ-tsal of Žo-don a great defeat upon "Khrom", the Btsan-po himself being present (Chronicle, ll. 232–3). It seems, therefore, likely that "Khrom", though it was afterwards regarded as a country, was originally "the city", meaning the great city or metropolis (of the Dru-gu), whether this was Guchen or Turfan or Karashahr or some other, and it became in popular talk the name of a country in the same way as Rome became Rūm. The Tibetans, however, seem sometimes to distinguish between "Phrom", or "Khrom", and Ge-sar: for instance, the *Rgyal-rabs* (fol. 21*a* 6) speaks of the *four* kings, of India, the Stag-gzig (Tajiks), Ge-gsar (Ge-sar), and Khrom (*Rgya-gar-chos-kyi-rgyal-po, Stag-gzig-nor-gyi-rgyal-po, Ge-gsar-dmag-gi-rgyal-po, Gzugs-mdzes-Khrom-gyi-rgyal-po, bžiḥi-blon* . . .), and in the Bon (schematistic) geography, there is even mention of a range of mountains separating Phrom from Ge-sar. Is it possible that we have here a reminiscence of the distinction between the two kingdoms of "Anterior Chü-shih" (Turfan) and "Posterior Chü-shih" (Guchen), separated, as in fact they are, by a mountain-range?

What then is to be said of Professor Pelliot's convincing suggestion of a connection between *Phrom* (*Fu-lin*) and *Rome* and between *Ge-sar* and *Caesar* (*JA.*, 1914, i, pp. 498–9; 1923, i, pp. 83–8; approved by Dr. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, pp. 436–7)? The syllable *prom* certainly occurs otherwise in

Chinese Turkestan, and I can only conclude that the always unhappy nomenclature of that region has provided us with two, if not three, *p(h)roms*. *Ge-sar* may be a dynastic title (like *Po* in Kucā) ; the *kingdom* Kesara (Ki-sa-lo) traced by Professor Lévi (*BEFEO.* v, p. 283) seems not to belong to Chinese Turkestan.

In any case, however, a connection between the name Dru-gu and the people of the Guchen region seems to have been made out. By the Tibetans, who came late upon the scene, the name must have been received from their Turkestan neighbours. The Khotanese, when invaded by the Tu-yü-hun from Shan-shan (absorbed by that people, as we have seen in the year A.D. 445), applied the name to them also. The Chinese account of the history of the Tu-yü-hun is definite, and Professor Pelliot has adduced (*JA.*, 1912, ii, pp. 520–3 ; 1914, ii, p. 144 n. ; 1916, i, p. 122 ; *T'oung-Pao*, 1920–1, pp. 323–5) direct evidence for the equation Tu-yü-hun = *Ḥa-ża*. He, however, regards the name *Ḥa-ża* as properly denoting mixed tribes of the north of Kan-su, and applied to the Tu-yü-hun from outside, by the Tibetans among others. What we have suggested is that the Tibetans (who speak of a *Ḥa-ża* kingdom long after the overthrow of Tu-yü-hun) understood by the term *Ḥa-ża* the people of the Shan-shan area, and knew the Tu-yü-hun, who had long dominated the Shan-shan kingdom, as *Drug-cun*.

The Title Bogdo

The title *Bogdo*, applied to " Gesser Chan ", was borne by Mongol sovereigns, beginning with Cingis Khan : in the forms *Pog-ta* and *Bog-do* it appears in the Tibetan accounts of Mongolia (see the *Hor-chos-byuṅ*, edited by Huth, pp. 16 sqq., and the dictionaries). In the Guchen area the title forms part of the name of the Bogdo-Ulā mountain, " the mountain of Bogdo " or " the holy mountain " (Klaproth, *Sprache und Schrift der Uigur*, p. 47). The designation may or might be Mongol ; but the term *bogdo* must be far older than the first

appearance of the Mongols in the vicinity of Chinese Turkestan, if it was used as a title by Khotan kings at least in the early part of the seventh century A.D. Several Khotan kings of about that period are mentioned by the Chinese with names wherein the syllables *Wei-she*, = Sanskrit *Vijaya*, are replaced by the syllables *Fu-tu*: these are Fu-tu-Hiung, Fu-tu-Sin, and Fu-tu-Ta. The Chinese character transliterated *Fu* had in Turkestan during Tibetan times the pronunciation *Bug* (*JRAS.*, 1926, p. 516; cf. Karlgren's *Analytical Dictionary*, no. 46), while the *tu* seems hardly to be found except in transliterations; other characters, however, with the value *tu* in modern times are used to transliterate *do* (*JRAS.*, 1926, p. 517). The title *Bogdo* might possibly have been introduced by the Juan-Juan, one of whose kings was, in fact, named *Fu*(Bug)-*t'u* (Cordier, op. cit., i, p. 347); but in all probability it came from the Turks, since in the time of Hiuan-Tsang the king of Khotan "had been subject to the Turks" (Abel-Rémusat, *Histoire de la Ville de Khotan*, p. 35). Is the title *Bogdo* then the *Bagatur* of the Turks, which the Chinese represent by *Mo-ho-tu* (Chavannes, op. cit., index)? This is *prima facie* improbable, since Chinese *Mo* would hardly represent a syllable containing a *u* (or *o*) vowel. Whether the word is Turki at all or, perhaps, a borrowing from an older population is a question for the philology of the eastern Turkī language.

b. The *Hor* (Turks)

In the documents there are rather frequent references to a *Bzaṅ-Hor-gyi-sde* "'Good' Hor Regiment". We have already (*JRAS.*, 1930, pp. 287–8) cited one: we have further—

18. M. Tāgh. 0345 (wood, c. 13 × 2 cm., complete; ll. 1 (faint) *recto* + 1 *verso* of cursive *dbu-can* script).

Bzaṅ.Hor.gyi.sde.dbrad.Rgan.pho. (*Repeated verso*).

"The *dbrad* Rgan-pho (*or* old?) of the Bzaṅ-Hor regiment," where *dbrad* is a military designation previously noticed (*JRAS.*, 1930, pp. 61, 89).

Apart from the regiment we have already encountered in

the documents two references to the Hor (1928, p. 584; 1930, p. 269); and an individual Hor named Baṅ-Gsas-byin (1928, p. 574), i.e. "Gsas-byin of the Baṅ clan" or "two Hors, Baṅ and Gsas", the former being the more probable, since a clan name Baṅ has been traced at Śa-cu (ibid., p. 91). Further references are :—

19. M. Tāgh. *c*, iii, 0019 (wood, c. 13·5 × 1·5 cm., complete, hole for string at right; ll. 2 of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script).

[1] ꠸ || Ñi.mo.bagi.sde.Rhye.lig.Ḥor.Khen.tiṅ.tse.[2] ḥog.pon. |

"The Ñi-mo-bag regiment; the Rhye-lig Hor Khen-tiṅ-tse, corporal."

Rhye-lig is probably the name of a clan or of a locality.

20. M. Tāgh. *b*, i. 0058 (wood, c. 12·5 × 2·5 cm., complete; hole for string at right; ll. 2 of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script, rather smudged).

[1] ꠸ |:| Ḥo.tso.bagi.sde | Sñel.Hor [2] Ña.gzigs |

"The Ho-tso-bag regiment; the Sñel Ḥor Ña-gzigs."

The Ho-tso-bag (pag) regiment is several times mentioned (M. Tagh. *a*, iii, 002, *b*, i, 0058, 0095 (*JRAS.* 1930, p. 55), *c*, i, 004, ii, 006). *Sñel* is probably a place-name, since a Sñel *cor* is mentioned in Bstan-ḥgyur colophons (Cordier, *Index du Bstan-ḥgyur*, i (ii), p. 66, ii (iii), p. 471). In another fragmentary document (M. Tāgh. *a*, iv, 00149, paper) we have a reference to "eight Sñel Hors".

21. M. Tāgh. *c*, i, 003 (wood, c. 10·5 × 2 cm., complete; hole for string at right; ll. 2 of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script).

[1] ꠸ | : | Hor.na.Ne(o ?) ḥu.żuṅ.gyi.mchid [2] gso[l] [.*baḥ*]

"Letter-petition of Ne[o ?]ḥu.żuṅ in Hor" (*or* "of Na-ne(o ?)ḥu-żuṅ, the Hor").

In Tibetan literature and history the Hor play, of course, a very important part, and it only remains to mention that a "'Good' Ḥor" is named in the Chronicle (ll. 196–7).

c. The Phod-kar

A Phod-kar man from Skyaṅ-ro and a Phod-kar [regiment] have been cited *supra* (1930, pp. 55, 273). The latter recurs in :—

22. M. Tāgh. 0291 (wood, c. 14 × 1·5 cm., fragmentary at right ; l. 1 of ordinary, cursive, *dbu-can* script).

ཨ | Phod.kar.gyi.sde.Ska.ba.Klu

" Ska-ba Klu, of the Phod-kar regiment."

Ska-ba, named in the *Bstan-ḥgyur* (Cordier, ii (iii), p. 524 ; cf. also Grünwedel, *Lamaismus*, pp. 49 and 56, and Laufer, *Roman einer Tibetischen Königin*, p. 131), was connected with Bog-yul, and was certainly in [north-]eastern Tibet. Since Skyaṅ-ro belonged to the same region, and since the Thod-gar mentioned by Cordier (op. cit., i (ii), p. 33), belonged to Spyi-lcogs, which also was in the north-east (see *JRAS.*, 1927, p. 823), it is highly probable that the Phod-kar people inhabited that quarter ; and this fact is of some importance in regard to questions connected with the Tokhari.

The name *Phod-kar* or *Thod-kar*, although not given in the Tibetan dictionaries, occurs sometimes in Tibetan literary works and documents. Thus in the *Rgyal-rabs-gsal-baḥi-me-loṅ* (India Office copy, fol. 14*a*, 4) the mother of Sroṅ-btsan-sgam-po is said to have been Tshe-spoṅ-bza Ḥbri-ma Thod-kar, where the last two syllables probably denote her race, while Tshe-spoṅ is a district named in the *Rgyal-poḥi-bkaḥi thaṅ-yig*, fol. 21*b*, 1. In the Life (tenth century) of Padma-sambhava and generally in the later literature (e.g. in the *Dpag-bsam-ljon-bzaṅ*, edited by Śarat Candra Das, see Index), the name *Tho-gar*, *Tho-kar*, *Thod-dkar* denotes the historical Tokharī of the west.

The existence of the Phod-kar or Thod-kar of the east does not, however, require to be proved by such evidence as is set out above. For we have definite statements of the Greeks as to the existence of a mountain district Thagouros and a place Thogara on the route to the then Chinese metropolis ; and Professor Hermann in his highly instructive

work, *Die alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien*, i (Berlin, 1910), has identified the former with the Richthofen range and the latter with the city of Kan-cu (see the map); also a place named Ttaugara, which may possibly correspond to the city Thogara, is mentioned in a Saka-Khotanī document of about A.D. 800 (*Two medieval Documents from Tun-huang*, by F. W. Thomas and Sten Konow, p. 148). Seeing that we have early statements by Chinese authors (see Marquart, *Erān-šahr*, pp. 201–2; Chavannes in *T'oung Pao*, 1905; Franke, *Zur Kenntnischer Türkvölker und Skythen Zentralasiens* (Berlin, *Abhandlungen*, 1904), pp. 14, 26) to the effect that some remnants of the Ta-yueh-chi had remained behind after the flight of the latter to the west in c. 165 B.C., and had been active in the general region to which the mount Thagouros belongs, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the Phod-kar of our documents are in fact Thogari or Tokharī; in which case there can no longer be any question as to the original name of the people known as the "Ta-Yueh-chi". As regards the Chinese name itself, it is unsafe for a non-Sinologist, more especially after so much controversy, even to approach the subject.

14*th August*, 1931.

Postscript

In support of the above (p. 831) suggestion that *Ge-sar* (*Kesara*) was a dynastic name, I may refer to a colophon verse appended to a Saka MS. of the *Maitreya-samiti*. Our deeply lamented friend and colleague, that great scholar Ernst Leumann, has edited and translated it (p. 152) as follows:—

Pharṣata Ysaṃbastə parste pīḍe haṃtsa-pūra Kəysar-kulna
āś'ərī Puñabhadrə hīvī cu kidə bryīcye ba'hsə
"Pharṣavata hat das Ysaṃbasta veranlasst zu
schreiben [= hat Auftrag gegeben, eine Abschrift des
Ysaṃbasta herzustellen], samt (ihren) Söhnen, aus dem
Kaisergeschlecht (stammend) . . ."

The translation in general I am not in a position to control. But it seems obvious that *Kəysar* whatever its origin (and Leumann in his note refers to Professor Lüders' discovery of *kaïsara* in the Kharoṣṭhī Ārā inscription and to the *Kesar Saga*) cannot at the date of the MS. *mean Caesar* or *Kaiser*, and that it must be the actual dynastic which we have conjectured. No doubt, Leumann has conclusive reasons for regarding *Pharṣa[va]ta* as feminine ; otherwise it might have been the name of a possibly discoverable king.

Could the name be related to the *Bars-bäg* of the Orkhon inscriptions (ed. W. Thomsen, Index) ? Could the " dogs of Fu-lin " (Chavannes, op. cit., p. 103), which came from Turfan, be dogs of *Phrom* in the sense of Turfan ?