

was Yü-ch'ih is stated to have had as personal name (*tzü*) 屋密 Wu-mi (*Uk-miēt), and the same reading occurs in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 126; *TP*, 1904, 4). In texts of the T'ang period, the *wu* of Wu-mi is often corrupt for 屈 *ch'ü* (*k'iuət); and the *Chiu T'ang shu* (198, 8 a) actually gives Ch'ü-mi, which is no doubt correct. But neither *Uk-miēt nor *K'iuət-miēt suggests any foreign form reconcilable with what we know of the royal lists.

The names of most of the successors of Yü-ch'ih Ch'ü-mi are given in Chinese sources as beginning with 伏 闍, followed by a last character which is different for every king. CHAVANNES had read the first two characters as Fu-tu (*Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 325; *TP*, 1904, 99, 109). Sten KONOW was told by sinologists that the proper reading was «Fu-ch'a», and saw there «another rendering of Vijaya, or, rather, of Viśa» (*JRAS*, 1914, 347). To this LÉVI added that the second character was the regular transcription of -*ja*-, and that, in his opinion, 伏 *fu* was certainly corrupt for 吠 *fei*; *fei-shê* would render Vija = Vijaya, and would even be a more accurate rendering than the earlier Yü-ch'ih (*JRAS*, 1914, 1020-1021). THOMAS, in his recent *Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 162, retains, however, «Fu-tu», because he believes it to represent Boydo (*JRAS*, 1931, 832; 1937, 309-313).

The case is somewhat embarrassing. One point is not open to doubt: the first two characters are a transcription; moreover, it is not an «adopted» transcription as in the case of Yü-ch'ih, since there is no other example in Chinese of the combination of the two characters which CHAVANNES read Fu-tu. THOMAS's theory cannot be accepted. *Boydo*, «holy», is a comparatively late form in Mongolian. The Mongol spelling is *boyda*, plur. *boydas*. In the *Secret History*, we still find *boḥda* (§§ 200, 254), *boḥta* (read *boḥda*, § 254), and only once *boḥdo* (§ 121), which must be the result of a popular pronunciation at the end of the 14th cent., since the Ulān-Bātor ms., in the corresponding passage, reads *boda* (corrupt for *boḥda*). The evolution *boḥda* > *boḥdo*, *boydo*, is of the same type as *Odan* > *Odon*. Tib. *bog-to*, *pog-ta*, *Yatuk bogdo* are borrowed from the Mongolian (cf. LAUFER, in *TP*, 1916, 495; *Sino-Iranica*, 576). The word does not exist in Turkish at an early date. It is not given in *Kāšyari*. The forms *poyda*, *puyda* of some modern Turkish dialects (RADLOV, II, 1267, 1362), the pseudo-Uighur forms *poktas* of RADLOV, II, 1264, and *boydaz* of RAMSTEDT, *Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 49, are misreadings of *boydas*, which is actually given in the Sino-Uighur Vocabulary of the Ming period and is merely borrowed from the Mong. plural *boydas*. We cannot so far trace the word beyond the Mongol period; it is just as arbitrary to connect it, as THOMAS does, with the Juan-juan name 伏圖 *Fu-t'u* (*B'juk-d'uo) as it would be to identify with it the T'o-pa Wei name 伏陀 *Fu-t'o* (*B'juk-d'â; on which cf. Lo Chên-yü, *Wei shu tsung-chih chuan chu*, piao, 22 b). SCHOTT's Indian etymology *bhakta* is certainly wrong (*Abh. Bay. Ak. d. W.* 1877, 5); BLOCHET's derivation from Pers. *boḥta* (*JRAS*, 1915, 308) would be more satisfactory from the phonetic point of view, but it lacks all other support. I would rather suppose with RAMSTEDT (*loc. cit.* 49) that *boyda* > *boydo* is a purely Altaic word, connected with Tung. and Oroč. *buga*, Goldi *boa* (cf. P. SCHMIDT [ŠMITS], *The Language of the Oroches*, Riga, 1928, 27).

But, apart from the history of the word *boyda*, there is a point of Chinese phonetics which I consider fatal to THOMAS's argument. Nobody knows why CHAVANNES transcribed the term as