

**J. R. Russell**

*Columbia University*

H.W. Bailey, *The Culture of the Sakas in Ancient Iranian Khotan*,  
The Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies, I, Bibliotheca Persica,  
ed. by E. Yarshater,  
Caravan Books, Delmar, N.Y., 1982, xii + 109 pp.

Sir Marc Aurel Stein, who first excavated Khotan, at the turn of the century, describes it as a fertile oasis of banked fields, hamlets, fruit gardens, poplar-and willow-lined roads and canals, its rich soil watered by the Yurung Kāsh and Kara Kāsh rivers, which flow down from the foothills of the Kun Lun mountains, join together 80 miles north-northeast of Khotan and penetrate the terrible Taklamakan desert north to the basin of the Tārīm. Modern Khotan was still famed for its white and colored jade, called *Kāš* (hence the names of the rivers), and its inhabitants cultivated the silk worm and made paper of mulberry bark.<sup>1</sup> The hospitable oasis, between the rugged Kun Lun and the desert whose name means 'go in and you won't come out' was a natural spot for civilized settlement; and it possessed the further advantage of lying on the southern branch of the Silk Route through Central Asia. Beginning at Antioch and Tyre, the ancient road passed through Palmyra and Ecbatana (Hamadan to Merv, whence one travelled north to Bukhara and over the Pamirs to Kashghar, or south by Bactra (Balkh) to Yārkanḍ. The road branched at Kāshghar: the northern road followed the Tārīm by Kucha and Turfan, south of the Tien Shan range, to Tun Huang; the southern road reached Tun Huang by way of Yārkanḍ and Khotan, and from Yārkanḍ one could travel also south through the Karakoram Pass to Srinagar in Kashmir. From Tun Huang, with its famous monastery of a thousand caves, the road continued to its end at Ch'ang-an.

Communities of various faiths and tongues settled along the Silk Route to trade and to proselytize; and, in the case of Iranian Manichaeans from the Sasanian Empire at least, also the escape Persecution. Manichaean manuscripts in a variety of languages, including Parthian and Middle Persian, have been found at Turfan. The Sogdians, an Iranian people from the area of Samarkand, had early settled in the area; Sogdian documents, some of which were written as far east as Tun Huang, refer to Sogdian trading communities in China. Manichaean, Christian and Buddhist texts have been found in Sogdian, reflecting the religious diversity of individual ethnic groups. There are also references, principally in Manichaean works, to Zoroastrianism and Iranian paganism in Sogdia; Soviet research in the material culture of Sogdia itself has augmented our knowledge of these two latter traditions. But Buddhism, brought from India, has left the strongest

imprint on the culture of the cities around the Taklamakan, particularly in art. And although Sasanian and earlier Iranian elements may be found in the art, the strongest influence is Indian. Because of this Buddhist and Indian predominance, some scholars have tended perhaps insufficiently to evaluate the Iranian elements in the ancient culture of Chinese Turkestan. <sup>2</sup>

The history of Khotan reflects the ethnic mixtures and Buddhist influences described above. The foundation of Khotan probably coincided with the reign of the Indian emperor Aśoka (3rd cent. B.C.), and the earliest coins bear legends in Chinese on one side and Prakrit, an Indian language, on the other. The literature, for all periods, is wholly Buddhist, and that religion must have been introduced at the very beginning, by the Indian settlers. One Tibetan text describes Khotan succinctly as a country where Indians and Chinese meet: the script is Indian, the religious language and religion are Indian, the customs are Chinese, but the common language is neither Indian nor Chinese. <sup>3</sup> The language is Saka, a North Iranian tongue related to present-day Wakhī, and, more distantly, to the speech of the Ossetic settlers in the north Caucasus. The Sakas must have settled in the Khotan oasis and at nearby Tumsūq, where documents in a dialect have been found closely related to Khotanese, around the time of the foundation of Khotan or soon afterwards. The Sakas 'from beyond Sogdia' are mentioned in Old Persian inscriptions; in the 2nd cent. B.C., Chinese sources refer to Sakas northwest of Kāshghar, and at the same time Saka tribes overpowered the Greek rulers of Bactria and pressed on to ancient Drangiana, which came to be known thenceforth as Sakastāna (modern Sīstān). In the West, the Saka hero Rustam *Sagz* 'the Saka' (Armenian *saglik*) entered the Persian epic tradition later to be set down as the *Shāh-nāme*; in the East, the Sakas seem to have achieved a position of political and social dominance as well. For Iranian administrative titles are found in early documents and in the Prakrit inscriptions on coins; Khotanese Saka was probably employed at court in Khotan long before the 10th cent. A.D., although it is most firmly attested for that late date.

In the 1st cent. A.D., Khotan was under Chinese political influence; in the Sasanian period, it came under the successive suzerainty of nomads, Hephthalites, Western Turks, and the Chinese again. With the exception of the latter, all these invaders at different times gravely threatened the stability of the Sasanian Empire and were repulsed by it; but the Sasanians do not seem ever to have reached Khotan, except perhaps as traders or emissaries to China. In the 7th century, Khotan suffered invasion by the Tibetans, but the latter were driven out by the Uighurs in the 9th cent. From the late 9th cent. to ca. 1005 Khotan seems to have enjoyed independence, and an embassy to China is recorded, but in the early 11th cent. Khotan was conquered by Yūsuf Qadir Khān, and within about a century the local language had been largely replaced by Turkish. There are no Khotanese documents after the 10th cent.,

nor are there any that show Islamic influence.<sup>4</sup> Marco Polo visited the area, and wrote that all at 'Cotan' were Muslims, subjects of the Great Khān. The venetian traveller praised the abundance of cotton, wheat, wine and other goods, and noted, as Chinese authors before him had done, that women were treated well and accorded unusual liberties: they rarely wore the veil, for instance. The people enjoyed music and singing.

The literature of Khotan reflects a Buddhist milieu, and the various major sects are represented. There had early been Mahāsāṅghika monasteries, and Theravadin texts in Prakrit have been found in Khotan, but the people were in the main Mahāyānists. The later Vajrayāna school is reflected in some works. Documents have been recovered mostly from Buddhist *Vihāras* (monasteries); chancellery and private correspondence also has been found. There are love poems, letters in Chinese and Tibetan written in Khotanese *Kharoṣṭhī* script, a Sanskrit-Khotanese phrase book for travellers, and a geographical text on Kashmīr. It is recalled that a road to Kashmīr debouches from nearby Yārkanḍ, and the former country was much revered as the source of Central Asian Buddhism. The bulk of Khotanese literature consists of Buddhist texts in translation.<sup>5</sup> The task of deciphering, interpreting and publishing the corpus of Khotanese works has been accomplished largely by Sir Harold Walter Bailey, Emeritus Professor of the University of Cambridge, and his pupil, Professor R.E. Emmerick of the University of Hamburg. This monumental labor, requiring a formidable knowledge of Indo-Iranian languages and literatures, as well as the tongues of the surrounding Turkic, Sino-Tibetan and other peoples, must be considered amongst the finest achievements of linguistic science in this century. Bailey and Emmerick's series of *Khotanese Texts*, now in eight volumes, and Bailey's *Dictionary of Khotan Saka* (Cambridge, 1979), represent the groundwork of the field of Khotanese studies, to which Bailey has devoted most of his waking hours since 1936. His Ratanbai Katrak Lectures of that year, published in 1943 and reprinted with additions in 1971 as *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-century Books*, became the model, with their precision and sobriety, for serious subsequent studies in the Pahlavi Texts. Bailey's scores of articles illuminate various aspects of Iranian in Central Asia; his Columbia Lectures of 1979 here reviewed bring together many different aspects of Khotanese culture illuminated in the texts. According to Bailey, the material of the lectures is to be treated in much greater detail in a ninth *Ergänzungsband* of the *Khotanese Texts*; one hopes that volume will contain extensive discussion of various problems of Khotanese culture and society, for there is but sparse subjective analysis of the mainly lexical material in these lectures, which may serve best as an annotated subject index to the *Dictionary*.

It is not proposed in this review to offer a linguistic appraisal of this work, which does not in any case purport to be a linguistic study. To undertake such a task with any competence would require of the reviewer some knowledge of

a vast range of languages, from Germanic to Chinese, and it is hoped that aspects of Bailey's theories will be separately commented upon by Indo-Europeanists, Sinologists and others. Although experts in these fields, and Iranists as well, may have much to criticize, it is nonetheless a testimony to the vast scope of Professor Bailey's erudition that there are few scholars capable of approaching the work as a whole. I would offer here a few specific questions about the culture of Khotan which are raised by the presence of certain terms in Khotanese, but which do not receive adequate treatment. Again, it is most fervently to be hoped that these, and other issues, will receive extended, analytic treatment in Vol. 9 of the *Khotanese Texts*.

A number of religious terms known to Zoroastrianism are found in Khotanese forms. In no case is a term used with reference to any Zoroastrian subject, and all of the terms encountered may go back to pre-Zoroastrian religion amongst the Iranians, or to Iranian mythological and heroic traditions not confined to the Zoroastrians. The Khotanese word for the Sun, *urmaysdān-*, is 'retained from the Zoroastrian (or possibly earlier) divine name Ahura Mazdā but with suffix *-ān-* indicating dependency.<sup>6</sup> Forms from the name of Ahura Mazdā meaning 'Sun' are found in other Eastern Iranian languages: Chorasmian, Iskasmī and Sanglēčī. There is no doubt that Zoroastrianism was anciently and extensively practiced in Chorasmia, but a god named Ahura Mazdā may have been known to the pagan Iranians who never accepted Zoroastrianism.<sup>7</sup> The principal association of the Sun in Zoroastrianism is with the Ahura Mithra, not Ahura Mazdā, hence New Persian *mīhr* 'Sun',<sup>8</sup> and in iconography Mithra and the Sun share also the image of a chariot with swift horses. Although the Sun, as the greatest of all celestial fires, is a most potent Zoroastrian symbol, that is perhaps insufficient reason for it to be associated so specifically with Ahura Mazdā. One may speculate that the Zoroastrians were seen thrice daily to face the Sun in invocation and to look towards its place in the sky—reverence for the Sun became the hallmark of Zoroastrians in Christian Armenia, called *Arewordik*' 'Children of the Sun'<sup>9</sup>—and the Sun came to be called after their God, Ahura Mazdā. Chavannes noted that Chinese annals of the Tang period describe the 'cult of the Celestial God' at Khotan and suggested that Ahura Mazdā is meant.<sup>10</sup> If this supposition is correct, and Ahura Mazdā was regarded specifically as a celestial god, the most prominent celestial body would appropriately be named 'belonging to Ahura Mazdā'. But it is not clear who worshipped and who named. The Choresmian evidence encourages one to suppose that Zoroastrians themselves so named the Sun, if indeed the name is not a survival of Iranian paganism, but in the 7th century A.D. such Zoroastrians as may have been seen at Khotan by Chinese travellers could be natives or refugees from the Arab invasion of Iran.

In Khotanese Buddhist texts, the name of Mount Sumeru is rendered by *ttaira haraysā* (i.e., Avestan *taēra*—with the name of *Harā Barzaitī*),<sup>11</sup> but this

toponym, so prominent in the Avesta, is part of pagan Iranian mythology as well, and need not have reached Khotan through the Good Religion. Khotanese *phārra-*, a term used to describe the stages of the life of a Buddhist *ārya-* 'monk', goes back to Old Iranian *farnah-* (Avestan *x<sup>v</sup>arənah-*), but for all the importance of this term in Zoroastrianism as the 'glory' which benefits the righteous and the noble, but deserts the wicked and the alien, it is found as an element in non-Zoroastrian Iranian names.<sup>12</sup> Monks and princes are called in Khotanese by the honorific *kai*, cf. Av. Kavi *Vīštāspa*, used in Western Middle Iranian to mean 'giant, monster' in Manichaean texts, and 'titan' (GK. *gigas gigantōn*) in a positive sense as an attribute of the Sasanian kings; but again, the word predates Zoroastrianism. Bailey devoted an article to Saka *śśandrāmata*, Avestan *Spənta Ārmaiti*, a Zoroastrian *Yazata* probably worshipped in pre-zoroastrian times whose name in Khotanese is used to render Buddhist Sanskrit *śrī-* 'prosperity and fortune'.<sup>13</sup> It would be desirable to have a comprehensive discussion of all the native Iranian religious terms found in various Khotanese usages, with consideration given to the question of Zoroastrianism in Khotan.

Although Iranian social and administrative terms are discussed from a linguistic standpoint in the lectures, there is, again, no extended analysis of the social system of ancient Khotan, and one can but hope for such a discussion in Vol. 9 of the *Texts*. For example, Bailey notes that in one Khotanese *deśanā* (profession of Buddhist faith) the writer expresses the hope that in all future incarnations he will be *āysāta-* 'high-born'.<sup>14</sup> We have also a genitive form *bāsī-vāraa-* 'son of the House' and other forms. Bailey notes the importance of the *Wāspuhr* in Iranian society,<sup>15</sup> but it would be desirable to have a precise comparison of the forms of this institution, as far as they can be known, in Sasanian and Khotanese society. Was the government of Khotan a wholly Iranized institution imposed upon a society otherwise influenced in its customs by Indian and Chinese usages? Chinese titles are also found; how were the offices they represent assimilated into the existing system? As for the ethnic composition of Khotan, did the Iranian element become entirely intermingled with the other nations of the region, or was there differentiation associated with social class?

It is well known that Buddhism was practiced within the frontiers of the late third-century Sasanian empire, as well as in Iranian lands beyond the northern and eastern borders; the Zoroastrian high priest Kartīr boasts in his inscription on the Ka'aba-Yi Zardušt of having persecuted the *šmny* Buddhist monk(s)<sup>16</sup> and the latter word is found in Buddhist Sogdian as *šmn-* 'monk', with a feminine form ending in *-ānč* as well meaning 'nun'.<sup>17</sup> The form used by Kartīr is a loan-word from Eastern Iranian into Middle Persian.<sup>18</sup> There is evidence that the Sasanians destroyed a Buddhist statue in a Kushan Bactrian temple at Kara-tepe and built a Zoroastrian fire-altar in the niche that had held the image, during a campaign after the time of

Kartīr,<sup>19</sup> and it is reasonable to assume that Buddhism in Iran proper not only survived Kartīr's persecutions, as in Bactria, but spread westwards, For, as Prof. R.W. Bulliet has shown, a chain of towns named Naw Bahār in Persian, from Sanskrit *nava-vihāra*- 'new (Buddhist) monastery', stretches across the northern Iranian trade route as far west as Rayy.<sup>20</sup> The first Iranian contact with Buddhism, as far as it is attested in literary sources, may come much earlier in the *Vīdēvdāt*, a late *nask* of the Avesta probably composed in the Parthian period, around the 2nd cent. B.C. In *Vd.* XIX. 43 is mentioned a demon named Būiti, whose name has been interpreted by Bailey as that of the Buddha.<sup>21</sup> New Persian *bot* 'idol' might, correspondingly, refer originally to the carven images of the Buddha found in temples. The suggested date of the introduction of the demon Buiti in Avestan literature corresponds with the approximate time of the incursion of the Sakas into Drangiana, and perhaps the knowledge of Buddhism followed them to Iran.<sup>22</sup> The *Vīdēvdāt* itself, a 'law against the Demons' which is devoted largely to questions of Zoroastrian ritual purity, appears to be a reaffirmation of orthopraxy written at a time of upheaval when the traditional usages of the Religion were threatened. Troubles in the West, and Saka advances perhaps as far west as Mesopotamia, shook th Parthian kingdom, and, if the Buddhist religion had accompanied the Sakas, a new religion, too, must be repelled by the Iranian Zoroastrians.<sup>23</sup> It is to be hoped that the study of the Khotanese texts will assist historical investigation of the periods and routes of the penetration of Buddhism into Iran. The question of particular Iranian contributions to the Mahāyāna sect, as in the doctrines of salvation, is also an area in which the Saka evidence may be of assistance. Each of the questions raised above: Zoroastrianism amongst the pastoral Saka peoples, the coorespondence of social and ethnic divisions in Central Asia, and the beginnings of Buddhism in Iran- would occupy many years of a distinguished scholarly career, and it is some measure of the esteem in which Prof. Bailey, a *kavi* amongst mortal scholars, is held, that one may look to his pen for a careful, reasoned discussion of these matters.

Lest it appear that one has been critical of Prof. Bailey for failing to go beyond a listing and linguistic analysis of terms relating to the arts, rule, economy and faith of Ancient Iranian Khotan, a word must be said about the circumstances of the lectures themselves. The Columbia Lectures, chaired and organized by Prof. Ehsan Yarshater, are designed to provide a forum for distinguished Iranists to present in publishable form an account of their research in some area of Iranian studies, ancient or modern. The widest possible scope is afforded in the choice of a topic. Prof. Bailey's lectures were to be delivered over five consecutive days, with one hour allotted to each lecture; the latter, in fact, never lasted less than two hours, and at the end of each Prof. Bailey fielded questions from his weary and bedazzled listeners, without himself showing the slightest sign of fatigue. But for the firmness of

the Columbia janitors and the departure of the audience, the lectures might have been thrice their present length. Asked by one listener for a concise statement of the importance of Khotanese studies to the field of history in general, Bailey suggested that here was a civilization whose language proved that, long before Central Asia was Muslim or Turkic, great Iranian cultures thrived across its vast expanses. On another occasion, in Cambridge, a Parsi friend of mine asked Prof. Bailey over tea on a warm summer afternoon in the great scholar's cluttered study why he had chosen such a remote, demanding and rather lonely field of study. Prof. Bailey said there was a romance at the core of it. Romance, a passion for precision and truth, and the brilliant labor of a long lifetime inform these lectures, as they do most every line Prof. Bailey has written.

#### NOTES:

1. For a description of Khotan and the earliest excavations there, see M. Aurel Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, Oxford, 1907 (repr. Hacker Art Books, N.Y., 1975). The explorations and excavations in Chinese Turkestan, beginning with Sven Hedin in 1895, are vividly chronicled in P. Hopkirk, *Foreign Devils on the Silk Road*, London, 1980.
2. See, for example, the catalogue by H. Hartel et al., *Along the Ancient Silk Routes*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1982. It is striking how little attention is paid to the strong Iranian element in the population of Central Asia, not to mention the Iranian influences in the development of the culture of the area.
3. For this source, see R.E. Emmerick, 'The Historical Importance of the Khotanese Manuscripts,' in J. Harmatta, ed., *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*, Budapest, 1979, 167-77.
4. On the Muslim conquest of Central Asia, see W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, 4th ed., London, 1977.
5. For a survey of Khotanese literature, see H. W. Bailey, 'Khotanese Saka Literature,' in E. Yarshater, ed., *Cambridge History of Iran (CHI)*, Vol. 3, part 2, ch. 34; and R.E. Emmerick, *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan*, Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series, III, Tokyo, The Reiyukai Library, 1979.
6. Bailey, P. 29.
7. See M. Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, I, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Leiden, 1975, 37-40; Bailey discusses some of the correspondences between the Vedic and Iranian pantheons in 'The Second Stratum of the Indo-Iranian Gods,' in J.R. Hinnells, ed., *Mithraic Studies*, I, Manchester, 1975.
8. See, for instance, H. Lommel, *Die Yäšt's des Awesta*, Göttingen, 1927, 64.
9. The conclusions of one's analysis from a Zoroastrian point of view of this material, collected and studied by H. Bartikyan in *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, N.S. 5, 1968, 271-88, and earlier by Fr. E. Alisan, were presented at a seminar of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, Feb. 1977; they appear to have been repeated, without attribution or references (the latter noted in a review by Mr. Christopher Walker), in a recent popular book on Armenia by D.M. Lang, who attended the seminar.
10. Stein *Ancient Khotan*, 172.
11. *CHI* 3 (2), 1242.
12. E.A. Grantovskii, *Ranyaya istoriya iranskikh plemen perednei Azii*, Moscow, 1970, 157-8; the chapter 'Farrah' in Bailey's own *Zoroastrian Problems* remains the classic discussion of the term.
13. H.W. Bailey, 'Saka *śāndrānata*,' *Festschrift für Wilhelm Eilers, Wiesbaden*, 1967, 136.
14. Bailey, pp. 14, 68.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
16. *KKZ* line 9.
17. I. Gershevitch, *Grammar of Manichaean Sogdian*, Oxford, 1961, p. 159 (para. 1043).
18. M. Back, *Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften*, Acta Iranica 18, Leiden, 1978, 261.
19. B. Staviskii, *Kushanskaya Baktriya*, Moscow, 1977, 176 & n. II, 12.

20. R.W. Bulliet, 'Naw Bahār and the survival of Iranian Buddhism,' *Iran* 14, 1976, 140-5, in which it is suggested that Persian *naw* 'new' here may refer to a new school of Buddhism, perhaps specifically Iranian. Another possibility is simply to take the word literally, but as the name Naw Bahār, is used often, perhaps some further significance may be sought; the epithet 'new' may refer to a future and miraculous state, as in the Christian expression 'New Jerusalem'. Most opposite to the Buddhist 'new *Vihāra*' in Iranian usage is Manichaean Middle Persian *dēsman ī nōg* 'new building', associated with the 'new realm' made by *Nōg Sahrārfuryazd* 'the god-builder of the new realm', i.e., the Great Builder of the Manichaean pantheon, there will Ahrmen and Āz be imprisoned at the renovation of the world. *Frašegird* (F.C. Andreas, W. Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan*, I, Berlin, 1932, 12 & n. 1). In the Iranian Bundahišn, 1.31 (MS. TD2 13. 9-10), evil is said at the time of Frašegird to be banished *nōgtar* 'anew'. In Armenian, *nor* 'new' has the sense of 'miraculous' in the synonymous compounds *norahras* and *norask* and 'wonderful, very prodigious' (with *hras* from Mlr. *fras-*, cf. *Frašegurd*; and *Sk<sup>h</sup>anc<sup>h</sup>*, perhaps with Ir. prefix *uz-* to be associated with Arm. *K aj* 'titanic, brave, monstrous', derived from Mlr. by Szemerényi). By Naw Bahār the Iranian Buddhists may have meant not a new school of their faith, but rather an eschatological *Vihāra* whence *sansāra* was to be banished; this would accord also with the salvific character of Mahāyāna teaching, which may have been influenced in this regard by Iranian thought.

21. See H.W. Bailey 'The word *but* in Iranian,' *BSOS* 6, 1931, 2. The identification of Phl. *But* with Av. *Būiti* 'Buddha' seems certain, but Justi and others connected the Av. word with Skt. *Bhūta*-ghost' (see Bartholomae, *Air Wb.*, 968), whilst Nyberg has preferred to see in the name a demonization of Skt. *Bhūti*-fortune, thriving, welfare, an epithet of Lakṣmi (*Die Religionen des alten Iran*, German tr. by H.H. Schaeder repr. Osnabruck, 1966, 340). OIr. has a base *baod*-cognate with Skt. from which are *baodah* 'perception' and *Baodā*-smell' Sgd. *βωδ* 'smell' (Gershevitch, *Gram. Man. Sgd.*, para. 1193; *Av. Hymn to Mithra*, Cambridge, 1967, 159) but Sgd. *bwty* or *pwty* 'Buddha' ch. Av. *Būiti*, probably a loan-word from Eastern Iranian. like Man Pth. *bwt* 'Buddha'. \*

22. The 'abode of the Lie (*druj*)', Av. *drujaskana*, Vd. XIX, 41, is mistranslated in the Phl. version (ed. B.T. Anklesaria, p. 388) as *druz ī sagān* 'the lie of the Sakas'. The 19th *fragard* of the *Vīdēvdā*, which contains the only three references to *Būiti* in the text (*But*, in the Phl. tr.), is devoted largely to an exchange between Zarathuštra and Ahura Mazdā in which the Prophet receives instruction on how to repel evil demons from the world, particularly from (Eastern) Iran., *Būiti*, although a masculine demon, is called a *druj*, the latter a feminine form (see M. Boyce, *Hist. Zor.*, I, 87). It is conceivable that the Pahlavi translator may have regarded *But*, known to him as the Buddha, as the particular *druj* of the Sakas.

23. On the events of the reign of Phraates II, see A.D.H. Bivar in *CHI* 3 (1), 36-8; and E.G. Pulleyblank, 'The Wu-Sun and Sakas and the Yüeh-chih migration,' *BSOAS* 23, 154-60.

\* From the Mlr. form is derived NP *bo* 'idol'; the word must have acquired this additional meaning only in the late Arsacid or Sasanian period, for in the 2nd cent. B.C., when the name *Būiti* presumably entered Iranian. Buddhist iconography would have been at too early a stage for there to have been images ('idols') of the Buddha to impress Iranians (see M. Colledge, *Parthian Art*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1977, 11, 84). In any case Zoroastrians of the Parthian period, with their own images of the *Yazatas*, should scarcely have condemned the idolatry of others.