

## 83. BUCARA

*bacarch* VB  
*bacchara* TA<sup>3</sup>  
*bocara* FA, FB; R  
*bocara* F

*bochara* LT, P, VA  
*bochora* VL  
*bothara* P<sup>5</sup>  
*bucara* F, Fr, t

*buccara* L  
*buchara* V  
*bucharra* Z

This is of course Bokhara. On بۇھارە Buḥārā, cf. the excellent notice by BARTHOLD in *El*, s. v. « Bukhārā »; also *LS*, 460-463; *Mi*, 352 (and Index, 487). The modern Türkmen form is Buhāra.

The name has been supposed to come from a form \*Buḥār, which would be derived from Skr. *viḥāra*, « [Buddhist] monastery », and which occurs as *buqar* in Uighur and Mongolian, though the Sogdian form, which is the one one should expect to be used at Bokhara, was *varḥār* (the derivation of *varḥār* from *viḥāra*, which had been abandoned, is again maintained by HENNING in *BSOS*, IX, 570). *Vihāra* > *buqār* is of the same type as *viṣaṇa* > *bušan*, Śrīvijaya > Śrībuḥai, etc. I must add, however, that early Uighur texts only know *vrḥār* and *viḥār*; *buqar*, in a Uighur vocabulary of the Ming period (not « Puyar » as in RADLOV, IV, 1362), may be simply borrowed from the Mongolian. The word *viḥāra* occurs mainly in Iranian countries in the term نوبهار Naubihār or Nōbihār (< \*Navaviḥāra, « New Monastery »), which was later read Nōbahār and interpreted as meaning « New Spring » or simply « Spring ». The most famous Naubihār was the one at Balkh which Hsüan-tsang, c. 630, calls Navasaṅghārama, « New Monastery »; but there were a number of other Naubihār in Sind, at Samarkand, at Bokhara, and even at Ray (east of Teheran). I must confess that I do not see why we have only « New » monasteries in Iran; on them, cf. Stan. JULIEN, *Vie de Hsüan-tsang*, 65; *Mém.*, I, 30; BARBIER DE MEYNARD, *Dict. géogr.*, 112, 569; YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 630, 967; ELLIOT, *Hist. of India*, I, 149, 195; MARQUART, *Ērānšahr*, 69, 91, 138; BARTHOLD, *Turkestan*<sup>2</sup>, 77, 85, 86, 102; *Mi*, 108, 337. On the whole, it has not been proved that Bokhara had anything to do with *viḥāra*.

Bokhara occurs first in Chinese texts in the 5th cent. as 𠵹密 Niu-mi (\*Njəu-miēt), a regular transcription of its ancient name Nūmiḥ, Nūmiḥ-kāθ (*Wei shu*, 102, 5 b). When the name of the town of Bokhara makes its appearance, it has from the start the same form Buḥārā both in Arabic and Persian texts. In the 8th cent., the Turkish runic inscriptions of the Orkhon write Buqaraq (with an ancient Iranian final *-k* or *-g*), but, curiously enough, Hsüan-tsang and the other Chinese sources of the 7th-10th cents. give transcriptions which are based only on \*Buḥār, and this is also the form supposed by other transcriptions in the Mongol and even in the Ming periods. So we have 捕喝 Pu-ho (\*B'uo-χât) in Hsüan-tsang (JULIEN, *Vie*, 61; *Mém.*, I, 21); 布豁 Pu-huo (\*Puo-χuât, \*Puḥwar?; cf. *BSOS*, IX, 549) and 捕喝 Pu-ho (the latter form is clearly taken from Hsüan-tsang) in *Hsin T'ang shu*, 221 B, 1 b (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 136, 355; the « Pu-hwat-lu [= Buxār?] » of MARQUART, *Ērānšahr*, 309, does not exist);