

mean « God », as Iranian *baga* does in Achaemenid inscriptions (cf. Russian *bog*, « God »; and S. LÉVI, in *JA*, 1934, I, 19).

[The distinction between the senses of « sky », « Heaven » (the abode of God), and « God » is perhaps as elusive in the Chinese use of *T'ien* as it is in our own use of *Heaven*. On a scrap of paper found with the Ms. of this Note, PELLIOT had written : « For the idea of *T'ien* in the sense of a personal God, and of *T'ien-tzū* meaning Son of God, cf. the remarkable story in GILES, *Biogr. Dict.*, No. 393, given with still more detail in the original text of the *San-kuo chih*. » The story, given as an example of ready wit, is found in the notice of 秦宓 Ch'in Mi, 148-226 (*San-kuo chih*, 38 [*shu*, 8], 4-6). In the year 224, an envoy from Wu to Shu met Ch'in Mi there and catechized him about *T'ien*. « Has *T'ien* a name ? » the envoy asked, « Yes, Mi replied, and it is Liu ». « How do you know that ? » « The name of the *T'ien-tzū* is Liu (天子姓劉) », referring to Liu Pei, who had been enthroned the previous year. And again « For the term *T'ien-tzū* employed in Yün-nan for others besides the Emperor, cf. 棗林雜俎 *Tsao lin tsa tsu*, 和, 28 b. » A.C.M.]

Early Mussulman writers knew, however, the true meaning of *T'ien-tzū* and transferred it to *faγfūr* (or *baγbūr*). In 851, Sulaymān says that the Chinese Emperor « is called with the title of *baγbūr*, which means Son of Heaven; in Arabic, we say *مغور* *maγbūr* » (cf. FERRAND, *Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymān*, 62; *maγbūr* is surprising, and may be corrupt instead of *faγfūr*; for other examples of *m-* instead of *f-* in the transcription of the same term, cf. *infra*, and in Maš'ūdī once « Manšūrah » and another time, correctly, « Fanšūrah » [cf. *Hobson-Jobson*<sup>2</sup>, 152]). In the next century, Maš'ūdī speaks of a Chinese Emperor who « received the title of honour of *baγbūr*, that is to say 'son of heaven'; the title, however, which belongs to the sovereigns of China and which is always employed when addressing them is *tamγamā jabān*, and not *baγbūr* » (cf. BARBIER DE MEYNARD, *Les Prairies d'or*, I, 306; *طمنماجان* *tamγamā jabān* certainly is corrupt for *طمنجاج خان* *tamγāč hān*, « khan of the Taβγαč », given in Abū-'l-Fīda, II, II, 123; on Taβγαč = Chinese, see « Cin », p. 274). Speaking on the authority of information obtained in 966-967 A. D., the author of the *Fihrist* says : « The meaning of *baγbūr* in Chinese is 'son of heaven' » (*Fe*, 131). The Arabic word here used for « heaven » is *samā'*, which actually means « sky », « firmament », rather than « heaven »; not only does it not mean « god » as *baγ-*, but it does not even imply the meaning of « immaterial heaven », « Heaven », which attaches to Chinese *t'ien*.

Very similar to Chinese *t'ien-tzū* and Iranian *faγfūr* is Skr. *devaputra*, « son of the gods », a title to which S. LÉVI has devoted a learned monograph (*JA*, 1934, 1-21). As a title, the term has never been met with in Sanskrit literature, except in a passage of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*; yet it is of frequent occurrence in the epigraphy of the Kuṣaṇa, as the royal title of that dynasty. The apparent exception of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* may almost be said to confirm, rather than to qualify the exclusive use of the title by the Kuṣaṇa, as it seems that the work was composed under their rule, and merely extolls the title of the dynasty. Since the Kuṣaṇa had come from China, and remained in touch with the land of their origin, the conclusion seems almost necessary that they had followed the example of the Chinese « Son of Heaven ». Here, there seems to be some contradiction in LÉVI's views. On the one hand, he says (p. 15) that the notion of the « divine Heaven », *dya*, *Dyaus pitā*, had not outlived Vedic times, so that the secondary notion of *deva*, « a god », remained