tion.¹ The suggestion offered by K. Hori,² that the Chinese transcription should represent the Persian word *izad* ("god"), is not acceptable: first, New Persian cannot come into question, but only Middle Persian; second, it is not proved that *izad* was ever a title of the kings of Persia. On the contrary, as stated by Nöldeke,³ the Sasanians applied to themselves the word bag ("god"), but not yazdān, which was the proper word for "god" even at that time.

of Pārsa (Wei šu, Ch. 102, p. 6; T'ai p'in hwan yü ki, Ch. 185, p. 17). The foundation of this transcription is presented by Middle Persian bānbušn, bānbišn (Armenian bambišn), "consort of the king of Persia." The Iranian prototype of the Chinese transcription seems to have been \*bānbuzwiδ. The latter element may bear some relation to Sogdian wάδυ or wyδyšth ("consort").

97. 摸胡壇 mo-hu-t'an, \*mak-ku(mag-gu)-dan. Officials of Persia in charge of the judicial department 掌國內默訟 (Wei šu, Ch. 102, p. 6). K. Hori<sup>6</sup> has overlooked the fact that the element t'an forms part of the transcription, and has simply equalized mo-hu with Avestan moγu. The transcription \*mak-ku (mag-gu) is obviously founded on Middle Persian magu, and therefore is perfectly exact. The later transcription 饕餮 \*muk-gu (mu-hu) is based on New Persian muγ, mōγ.\(^7\) The ending dan reminds one of such formations as herbeòān ("judge") and mobeòān mōbeò ("chief of the Magi"), the latter being Old Persian magupati, Armenian mogpet, Pahlavi maupat, New Persian mūbid (which, according to the Persian Dictionary of Steingass, means also "one who administers justice, judge"). Above all, compare the Armenian loan-word movpetan (also movpet, mogpet, mog).\(^8\) Hence it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>R. Gauthiot, Essai sur le vocalisme du sogdien, p. x; P. Pelliot, Les influences iraniennes en Asie centrale et en Extrême-Orient, p. 11.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Spiegel Memorial Volume, p. 248.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Tabari, p. 452.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> HÜBSCHMANN, Armen. Gram., p. 116. In his opinion, the form bānbušn, judging from the Armenian, is wrong; but its authenticity is fully confirmed by the Chinese transcription.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> R. Gauthiot, Essai sur le vocalisme du sogdien, pp. 59, 112. The three aforementioned titles had already been indicated by Abel-Rémusat (Nouvelles mélanges asiatiques, Vol. I, p. 249) after Ma Twan-lin, but partially in wrong transcription: "Le roi a le titre de Yi-thso; la reine, celui de Tchi-sou, et les fils du roi, celui de Cha-ye."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Spiegel Memorial Volume, p. 248.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Chavannes and Pelliot, Traité manichéen, p. 170. Accordingly this example cannot be invoked as proving that muk might transcribe also mak, as formerly assumed by Pelliot (Bull. de l'Ecole française, Vol. IV, p. 312).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Horn, Neupersische Etymologie, No. 984; and Hübschmann, Persische Studien, p. 123.