



Igor V. Piankov

(Russia)

THE TOCHARI - WHO ARE THEY?

Keywords: Tochari, Yuezhi, Bactria, Central Asia, nomads.

Scholarship has many problems related to the notion of Tochari, including a complex one – the problem of the Tocharian language. This article, however, will not deal with this problem. Instead, we will consider the question of what is hidden under the name “Tochari”? Is the common belief true that the Tochari emerged from the depths of Central Asia and eventually settled in Bactria? In fact, this kind of question has never been raised because even ancient authors who wrote about this people described them in exactly the same way. But, their reports contain a lot of mystery and contradiction.

Most information about the Tochari is provided by ancient Classical (Graeco-Roman) and Chinese sources. The name in Greek and Latin texts has two main forms (apart from the options and ambiguities of the writings): the early form that is associated with stories of the invasion of nomads into Central Asia – “Tachari” or “Tachori”; and a later and unified form – “Tochari”. Chinese sources respectively contain the same two forms: “Ta-h(s)ia” (current spelling “Daxia”, “Dakhīa” in Bichurin's translation) which is possibly “Ta-ha” in the ancient pronunciation (as the sound “r” did not exist in the Chinese language at the time), and “Tu-ho-lo”. The *Hanshu* explicitly states that “Tuholo” is the same as ancient “Daxia/Ta-hia”.¹ The phonetic form of these names is sufficiently close; the conformity of Tochari and Tu-ho-lo is indisputable, as is the conformity of Tachari and Daxia/Ta-hia. There would have been no doubt at all, if not for an amazing difference in the description of the role of Tochari

¹ Bichurin 1950, 321–322.

on one hand and the Daxia/Ta-hia on the other in the stories about the invasion of nomads. Nevertheless, many researchers, including sinologists, support the view of the identity of these names.²

The main mystery about the Tochari is that they had a “twin people group” who was their constant companion. According to Chinese sources, their twin people group is the Yuezhi (Yüeh-chih). Almost everywhere the Yuezhi is mentioned, we also find the Tochari. It is therefore not surprising that the view of the historical identity of the Tochari and the Yuezhi is almost universally accepted. But, attempts to also equalize the names of these people phonetically have not been convincing. The name *Yuezhi* has a match in another ethnonym, which in Greek sources is also mentioned close to and in connection with Tochari. This is *Asioi*³ or rather, “*Asioi* or *Asianoi*”.⁴ In a parallel Greek source, *Asioi* matches *Iatioi*⁵ – a form of the name that seems to be even closer to the Chinese name *Yuezhi*.⁶

The available evidence suggests that the roles of the Tochari and the Yuezhi are clearly divided. When it comes to relocation, the Yuezhi always act as mobile, nomad element; whereas the Tochari (with one exception) act as sedentary population, living in cities. Impressions of the Tochari as migrants are formed mainly because the Tochari invariably appear in every important movement of

² On the history of the problem, see: Umniakov 1940, 186–187; Herrmann 1937, 1633–1634; Gardiner-Garden 1987, 45–46. J. Marquart, for example, was of the same opinion (Marquart 1901, 204; Markwart 1946, 143, 147).

³ On the history of the problem, see Olbrycht 1998, 94. The same opinion is presented by Markwart 1946, 145 and Tarn 1951, 284, recently also by Liu 2001, 114. But on the whole, the question of the correlation of the Tochari and the Yuezhi still remains a mystery. A recent popular book about Central Asia says: “In what respect Tochari relate to the Yuezhi is not completely clear” (Baumann 2000, 203).

⁴ Strabo’s account 11.8.2 offers: “Ἀσιοὶ καὶ Πασιανοὶ: “Asioi and Pasionoi”. But a correction has long been suggested which is now broadly accepted: “Ἀσιοὶ ἢ Ἀσιανοὶ (where Η ΑΣΙΑΝΟΙ > ΠΑΣΙΑΝΟΙ) or “Ἀσιοὶ οἱ καὶ Ἀσιανοὶ (about this latter version see: Markwart 1946, 144). On the history of the problem, see: Umniakov 1940, 184–185; Gardiner-Garden 1987, 40–43. The Pasionoi are nowhere else mentioned, and to make a complex hypothesis, as it sometimes happens, on the basis of one of the controversial names, which most likely appeared as a result of scribal (spelling) error, is very risky. To link this name with the name of the Massagetaean tribe called Apasiakai is wrong, since the latter lived on their Central Asian territories long before the invasion of the nomads in the 2nd century B.C.

⁵ The identity of names of Asioi and Iatioi did not seemingly cause any reasonable objection from anybody. It is likely that they present themselves as two dialectal options of the same ethnic name, something like Asia and Yatia (Tomaschek 1877, 68). The initial y- in the second word is characteristic of the Eastern-Iranian language, an article merged with the word (Freiman 1951, 43–44).

⁶ There were many phonetic reconstructions suggested for this Chinese word. Perhaps the most accurate for this period would be something like Ywati. On the history of the problem see: Gafurov 1972, 131–132; Gardiner-Garden 1987, 39.

the Yuezhi tribes. Their name also then becomes firmly associated with the area under consideration.

Let us consider the most famous episode of the joint history of the Yuezhi and the Tochari – the migration of the Yuezhi from the depths of Central Asia to Baktria and Sogdiana. Chinese reports found in *Shiji*, *Qian Hanshu* and *Hou Hanshu* tell that the Yuezhi originally lived in the area of Gansu and were defeated by the Huns in about 160 B.C. They moved to the west through Fergana to the upper Amu Darya region after 140 B.C.; they settled to the north of the river, subjugating the area to the south of the stream called Daxia characterized by numerous cities⁷. That is where the Chinese envoy Zhang Qian found them in 128 B.C. Daxia is clearly the designation of Baktria.

Ancient testimonies, all of which date back to Apollodoros of Artemita⁸ who lived at the end of the 2nd and the 1st c. B.C.,⁹ have reached us in two traditions. The first of these is presented in Strabo and Klaudios Ptolemaios. Strabo (11.8.2) lists the nomadic tribes who migrated “from beyond the Iaxartes river region” and “deprived the Greeks of Baktria”: the Asioi or Asianoi, the Tacharoi and Sakarauoi. Traces of the same information are presented on the map of Ptolemaios (*Geogr.* 6.12.4; 6.14.14) where Iatioi and Tachoroi are placed south of the Iaxartes (i.e. as already moved across the river), and further south Augaloi, and further west Sagaraukai. The composition of the tribes according to both records is identical.¹⁰ Both records went through a common intermediary, who on several indications was Poseidonios of Apamea. The intermediary subjected Apollodoros’ evidence to a significant remaking, for example in replacing the name of the river *Tanais* with *Iaxartes*.¹¹

⁷ Kriukov 1988, 236–241; Benjamin 2006, 87–109.

⁸ Piankov 1997, 233, 272–273.

⁹ This is according to the majority of researchers. V.P. Nikonorov (1998, 109–110) suggests a different date which in our opinion is too late.

¹⁰ At first glance, this is not the case. The Strabo’s list of tribes does not mention Augaloi, but they are listed in Ptolemaios. Let us pay our attention to the name of another tribe in the same list of Strabo: Σακάρουλοι. The text here is clearly corrupt. This is evidenced by extra και after the mentioned name, usually excluded by publishers. It seems the copyist hesitated between the two possible endings of that name: -λοι and -και. The second option gives the standard form of the name. Where did -λοι come from then? Could it be a remnant of what is missing in the name of Αύγαλοι in Strabo’s current text? We think that the scribe became confused by Strabo’s original text “ΣΑΚΑΡΑΥΚΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΑΛΟΙ” with its repeating ΚΑΙ and ΑΥ, which he considered corrupt. He “corrected” the text by removing the “extra”, and thus it became ΣΑΚΑΡΑΥΛΟΙ. For the attempts to present the latter form, appearing nowhere else, as reproduction of a real ethnonym, see: Umniakov 1940, 185; Gardiner-Garden 1987, 50–60.

¹¹ Piankov 1997, 233–234, 272–273. There is unclear testimony (Plin. *N.H.* 6.22) about the crossing of the Tanais by Scythian tribes: Piankov 1997, 233; cf. Markwart 1946, 304–308.

The second tradition is reproduced in Pompeius Trogus (Prol. 41) who states that “Baktria and Sogdiana were captured by Scythian tribes of Saraucae and Asiae”. Trogus is perhaps closer to the original forms; he says nothing about crossing the river, nor does he mention the Tochari among the nomads who invaded Baktria and Sogdiana.¹² But, he knows the Tochari, and the context in which they are mentioned testifies in favour of greater proximity of the Trogus’ account to Apollodoros, and the latter one to the Chinese evidence.

Trogus’ historical context (Iust. 42.1–2) is the following: Parthian king Phraates II fought with certain “Scythians”, who then appeared in the sight of the Parthians and who came from afar. He was killed fighting them, and his successor Artabanos continued fighting and “attacked the Tochari”. These events took place in about 128–123 B.C., at the time when the Yuezhi established their dominance over Baktria-Daxia, the changes witnessed by Zhang Qian in 128 B.C.

The course of these events can be reconstructed something like the following: the clash between the Parthian king and the militant Scythians was the first encounter of Parthians with Asioi (Asianoi) = Yuezhi, and the attack of his successor on the Tochari was the invasion of the Parthians in Daxia = Baktria, the territory of the Yuezhi. The conquering pressure of the Parthians on the east before and after these events was always carried out on the outskirts of Baktria, and, according to coin evidence, Margiana was Artabanos’ offensive base at that time.¹³

Why then does the source of Strabo and Ptolemaios refer to the Tochari as nomads who along with Asioi - Iatioi seized Baktria? I think of the following explanation: Poseidonios knew that the name *Tocharoi* appeared in Baktria with the arrival there of the Asioi, and without clear understanding of the subtleties of Baktrian history, simply included the Tochari into the general list of nomad-conquerors.

Subsequently, the name of the Asioi - Yuezhi disappeared in Baktria, although the Chinese traditionally continued to use that designation when referring to the Kushan state, which was founded by the descendants of the Baktrian Yuezhi. The name of the Tochari became so deeply rooted in Baktria that it gradually completely replaced the former name of the country. Already Ptolemaios (*Geogr.* 6.11.6), drawing from Maes Titianus (most likely around the turn of A.D.), talks about the “Tochari who were a large people group” in Baktria, and were largely involved in agriculture.¹⁴ It is from the name of this people group that the medieval designation of the country Tocharistan originates. In China,

¹² As we can see, the absence of the Tochari in the list of Trogus is not the result of simple negligence of its epitomator, as it is usually considered (see, for example: Herrmann 1920, 1618).

¹³ Olbrycht 1998, 89.

¹⁴ Berthelot 1930, 186.

this name in the form of *Tuholo* came into use in 4th century A.D., and, as already mentioned, the Chinese knew that Daxia (Ta-hia) was the more ancient form of the same name.

It appears to be a very strange picture. In 141 B.C., Baktria acts as an independent state (Iust. 36.1.4), but already in 128 B.C., Zhang Qian, who visited Baktria himself, did not hear about any Baktrians, but only talks about the Tochari. How can this be explained? In a period of maximum 10 years did a complete change of the settled urban population of the state take place? Some scholars think that is exactly what happened. It may be that before Baktria was conquered by the Asioi - Yuezhi, the Tochari were already settled in Baktria (as a sedentary agriculturalist people!) around 135 B.C.¹⁵ These Tochari went there in a different and separate way from the Asioi - Yuezhi and took possession of the country with the agreement of the Baktrian Greeks after the latter had gone over the Hindu Kush into Northern India that they conquered.¹⁶ Of course, this entire intricate story is pure fiction of contemporary scholars. There is not even a hint of it in the sources. And this kind of story in itself is totally unrealistic.¹⁷

Therefore, another hypothesis was suggested: Zhang Qian, having reached the Yuezhi in the west, decided that Baktria, the country where they lived, was a semi-mythical country Daxia, placed by the Chinese on the western fringes of their ecumene in the 3rd-2nd centuries B.C.¹⁸ But even this suggestion is clearly far-fetched. In Zhang Qian's description of Daxia, there is not a single hint that he perceived the country as some kind of fairyland. When describing this country and other Central Asian regions, Zhang Qian's aspiration attempted to convey their true phonation and as accurately as possible. But in the absence of another convincing explanation specialists generally adopted this hypothesis.

The same Chinese sources that talk about a Yuezhi migration from Gansu inform us that not all the Yuezhi went to the west. Some of them called *Lesser Yuezhi* stayed in Gansu and mixed with the local Tibetans.¹⁹ Here, having retreated to the mountains of Nanshan and the area of Lake Koko Nor, they played an active role even in the 1st-2nd centuries A.D. Can the Tochari be found here as well? Undoubtedly. According to Ptolemaios (*Geogr.* 6.16. 2. 5. 8), drawing from the Maes Titianus's itinerary, the people of Thaguroi, or Ithaguroi lived in

¹⁵ On the history of the problem, see: Tarn 1951, 295-296; Puri 1974, 189.

¹⁶ Marquart 1901, 206-207; 1905, 240-241; Markwart 1946 I, 144-145.

¹⁷ It is clear that the previously assumed destruction of the Graeco-Baktrian city of Ai Khanum by two successive waves of nomads finds now another, more convincing explanation. I have devoted to this issue a big article for the Franco-Soviet book in the 1990's, which however never got published.

¹⁸ On the history of the problem, see: Umniakov 1940, 186-187; Herrmann 1937, 1633-1634; Tarn 1951, 296-297.

¹⁹ Kriukov 1988, 240-241.

these areas at this time of history. All researchers agree in identifying them with the Tochari, the city of Thogara with Ganzhou, and the Thaguron or Ithaguron Mountain with Nanshan.²⁰ Even the Buddhist monk and translator Kumarajiva (4th century A.D.) directly translated the word “Tochari” (Tukhara) as *Lesser Yuezhi*. And in their ancient history, the Yuezhi and the Tochari are inseparable, even before the Yuezhi left Central Asia under the pressure from the Xiongnu (160 B.C.). According to Chinese sources from the Han period, the Yuezhi first lived between the city of Dunhuang (which did not exist at the time) and Qilian Mountains. As to the location of the latter, there is no common agreement as to whether it is Nanshan or the Chinese Tian Shan.²¹ But in any case, it is clear that at that time, the Yuezhi’s dominance was spread on to large territories including the entire Kashgaria (Tarim basin) and Hesi (Gansu corridor).²² This is confirmed by Chinese sources of pre-Han times (7th – 3rd centuries B.C.), in which the ancestors of the Yuezhi are mentioned under the name Niuzhi (with options) as the “jade people”. They mined jade and controlled its export to China where it was always of outstanding value.²³ This means that the region of Khotan was already part of the Yuezhi ancestors realm.

In the same area east of Khotan, the Buddhist pilgrim Xuanzang (7th century A.D.) saw the ruins of the settlements of “ancient Tuholo”²⁴, and an even earlier source (3rd century B.C.) knows ancient Daxia very well in these localities.²⁵ This shows that the people of ancient Daxia were, for the Chinese of the Tang era, the Tochari (Tuholo) who lived not only in Baktria, but also in Kashgaria. In both areas, they lived as a settled urban population. The ancient authors also talk about the Tochari in the same area when writing about the period prior to the Yuezhi migration to Baktria.²⁶ Their records go as far as to Apollodoros of Artemita (2nd – 1st centuries B.C.)²⁷ and Megasthenes (4th–3rd centuries B.C.), and the latter mentions that the Tochari mined jade.²⁸

The name Tochari is also mentioned in connection with the cities of northern Kashgaria located in the Tarim valley at the southern foothills of the Chinese

²⁰ This “Tocharian” nomenclature is seemingly communicated here in Tibetanized form. And if a reading with the initial “i” is correct, then it has the Eastern-Iranian article. This is a direct illustration of the message of a mixed ethnos of the Lesser Yuezhi.

²¹ On the history of the problem, see: Kriukov 1988, 237; Weinberg 1999, 242–243.

²² Kliashtorny, Savinov 1998, 172.

²³ Kriukov 1988, 236; Narain 1999, 4–5; Liu 2001, 117–118.

²⁴ On the history of the problem of ancient “Tuholo” and Daxia, see: Herrmann 1937, 1634; Umniakov 1940, 186–187; Puri 1974, 189.

²⁵ Marquart 1901, 207, 318–320.

²⁶ Tomaschek 1883, 205; Markwart 1946 I, 148.

²⁷ Piankov 1986, 16–18.

²⁸ Piankov 1987, 266–267.

Tian Shan. This area was historically populated by sedentary agriculturalists, such as *Tochri* (Тоҳри) and *Four Tochri* (Тўҳры), according to Uighur and Sogdian records (9th–10th centuries A.D.); *Five Taugara* according to Khotan-Saka records (8th–10th centuries A.D.); *Thokars* (*Tho-kar* with options), according to Tibetan records (5th–9th centuries A.D.), referring to them as an ancient people group who together with Chinese erected canals from Tarim.²⁹ The roots of this word usage in this region most likely go back to the era of the Yuezhi dominion in Kashgaria (before the Huns' supremacy). The Tochari appeared in the areas along the route taken by the Yuezhi during their migration to western Central Asia. Thus, it is considered that their name is contained in the designation of Fergana, the area of an ancient sedentary culture, which is recovered from the Chinese *Dayuan* as *Taxwar*.³⁰

I should note that I exclude from linking the names that are considered to be *Tochari* simply on the basis of phonetic similarity with the ethnonym *Tochari*. An example would be the Assyrian *Tuharru*. The same can be said in relation to linking the ethnonym *Yuezhi* (due to its highly hypothetical phonetic reconstruction) with well-known names such as *Massagetae* and *Scythians*.

These types of linkages are entirely unproven hypotheses, and a long way from the reality of the migrations of tribes and peoples. I also think that linking Akkadian names *Tukri* and *Guti* to *Tochari* is simply an unreliable assumption.

Therefore, in all the cases that we considered, the Tochari appear to be a sedentary “adjunct” to the nomadic Asioi - Yuezhi. This is quite accurately illustrated in the words of Trogus (Prol. 42): *Reges Tocharorum Asiani* – “Asiani Kings of Tochari”.³¹ Perhaps we can also add here a remark by a commentator to a poem by Dionysios Periegetes (Eustath. ad Dion. Per. 752): “some.... say, that Tochari – τριγενῆς”, if the last word is understood as “three tribes”. It seems that we have here a typical example of a complex society consisting of two main “tribes”: a normally dominant nomadic component (“kings”), and a sedentary farming component. The third component in such type of society is represented by a priestly corporation, which is also regarded as a tribe. It is the nomadic component, such as “Royal Scythians” or “Royal Sakas”,³² that always migrates, but the sedentary component remains settled on the spot.

²⁹ For a general overview of references about the Tochari related to this region, see: Herrmann 1937, 1633, 1636–1641; Umniakov 1940, 188–191; Gardiner-Garden 1987, 47.

³⁰ Gafurov 1972, 132.

³¹ Typically, these words are being interpreted as a reference to a certain event: “Asians (became) the kings of Tochari.” For an overview of the interpretations in this sense, see: Gardiner-Garden 1987, 37–40. But even Tarn pointed out that here we have in mind not an event, but a condition – an indication of the structure of a nomadic horde (Tarn 1951, 286–287, 533).

³² Piankov 1996, 38.

But the striking feature of this particular case that requires explanation lies in the fact that the settled component, wherever the Asioi - Yuezhi seem to appear, always happens to be the Tochari. It is hard to imagine that a sedentary people with an ancient urban culture would constantly move from one place to another and completely replace the existing sedentary population in their new location. The conclusion is clear: the term *Tochari* in the original sense is not an ethnonym, but a special term used for describing the settled component of nomadic hordes, although perceived as a people's name by the neighbouring nations. But the latter sometimes attached the term to the whole horde.

Perhaps the closest analogy for Tochari is “el” of the ancient Turks, a nomadic “empire” based on the military subordination of one part of it by another. The term “el” can mean “empire” as a whole, but mainly a subordinate part of it as the spoils of war.³³ In this regard, the researchers make an interesting observation. The kings from the Kushan clan – the heirs of the “royal” Asioi - Yuezhi tribe – never called themselves *Tochari*.³⁴ With this understanding of the word *Tochari*, it loses its significance and the old debate of whether or not Baktria-Daxia was divided into five principalities before the arrival of the Yuezhi or after.³⁵

It is most likely that the Asioi - Yuezhi themselves, judging by their language, belonged to the Saka tribes in a broader sense, that is they were the South-Eastern Iranians.³⁶ This does not exclude the possibility that the native language of the Kushan dynasty was a Central-Asian Indo-European language of a centum group.³⁷ So for the Asioi - Yuezhi, the Tochari were the local Baktrian Iranians and the remaining Greeks. But from the first centuries A.D., the Tochari already constituted a united nation with the predominating language being a direct successor of the Asioi - Yuezhi language for which Greek letters were adopted to render it. The local population called it *Tocharian* language and contemporary scholars call it *Baktrian*.

For the Lesser Yuezhi in Gansu, *Thagurs* were the local Tibetans, but subsequently these two nations got mixed up, and as a result the names Lesser Yuezhi and Tochari became equivalent. In earlier times, Tochari in southern Kashgaria possibly were the pro-Tibetan tribes who were occupying the area from Khotan to Lop Nor Lake³⁸ at that time. And in northern Kashgaria, near Turfan,

³³ Gumilev 1967, 101–102.

³⁴ Narain 1999, 6.

³⁵ About this disagreement, see: Puri 1974, 184–188; Narain 1999, 40–41; Staviskii 1977, 100–101; Litvinskii 1998, 409, 687.

³⁶ About the South-Eastern Iranian languages and people who carry them, see: Oranskii 1979, 119–127.

³⁷ Ivanov 1967, 118.

³⁸ Kriukov 1988, 273–274.

Karashar, and Kucha it was the people who spoke in Central-Asian/Indo-European dialects of a centum language group. In the 9th century A.D., the Uighurs called it *Tochri* and modern scholars now call it *Tocharian*.

Bibliography

- Baumann, B. 2000: *Abenteuer Seidenstrasse. Auf den Spuren alter Karawanenwege*, München.
- Benjamin, C. 2006: 'The Yuezhi Migration and Sogdia' in M. Compareti, P. Raffetta, G. Scarcia (eds.), *Ēran ud Anērān*, Venezia, 87–109.
- Berthelot, A. 1930: *L'Asie ancienne centrale et sud-orientale d'après Ptolémée*, Paris.
- Bichurin, N.I. 1950: *Sobranie svedeniī o narodach, obitavshikh v Srednei Azii v drevnie vremena*, vol. 2, Moskva-Leningrad.
- Freiman, A.A. 1951: *Khorezmiiskii ĩazyk. Materialy i issledovaniĭa I*, Moskva-Leningrad.
- Gafurov, B.G. 1972: *Tajiki. Drevneĭshaĭa, drevniaĭa i srednevekovaĭa istoriĭa*, Moskva.
- Gardiner-Garden, J.R. 1987: *Apollodoros of Artemita and the Central Asian Skythians*, Bloomington.
- Gumilev, L.N. 1967: *Drevnie tūrki*, Moskva.
- Herrmann, A. 1920: 'Sacaraucae' in *RE IA*, 1611–1620.
- Herrmann, A. 1937: 'Tocharoi' in *RE VIA*, 1632–1641.
- Ivanov, V.V. 1967: 'Īazykovye dannye o proiskhozhdenii kushanskoĭ dinastii i tokharskaĭa problema' *Narody Azii i Afriki* 3, 106–118.
- Kliashornyĭ, S.G., Savinov, D.G., 1998: 'Pazyrykskaĭa uzda. K preistorii khunno-yuechzhĭiskikh voĭn' in D.G. Savinov (ed.), *Drevnie kul'tury Tsentral'noi Azii i Sankt-Peterburg*, Sankt-Peterburg, 169–177.
- Kriukov, M.V. 1988: 'Vostochnyi Turkestan v III v. do n.e – VI v. n.e.' in S.L. Tikhvinskii, B.A. Litvinskii (eds.), *Vostochnyi Turkestan v drevnosti i rannem srednevekov'e. Ocherki istorii*, Moskva, 223–296.
- Litvinskii, B.A. 1998 (ed.): *Istoriĭa tajikskogo naroda*, vol. 1, Dushanbe.
- Liu, X. 2001: 'Trade and Pilgrimage routes from Afghanistan to Taxila, Mathura and the Ganges plains' *Hindistan. The Journal of Indo-Turcica* 1, 113–140.
- Markwart, J. 1946: 'Die Sogdiana des Ptolemaios', *Orientalia* 15, fasc. 1–2, fasc. 3, Roma, 123–149, 286–323.
- Marquart, J. 1901: *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps.Moses Xorenac'i*, Berlin.
- Marquart, J. 1905: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran* 2, Leipzig.
- Narain, A.K. 1999: *The Tokharians*, Shillong.
- Nikonorov, V.P. 1998: 'Apollodorus of Artemita and the date of his *Parthica* revisited' in *Electrum* 2, 107–122.
- Olbrycht, M.J. 1998: *Parthia et ulteriores gentes*, München.
- Oranskii, I.M., 1979: 'Vvedenie. Iranskie ĩazyki v istoricheskom osveshchenii' in V.S. Rastorgueva (ed.), *Osnovy iranskogo ĩazykoznanĭa. Drevneiranskie ĩazyki*, Moskva, 10–128.
- Piankov, I.V. 1986: 'Vostochnyi Turkestan v svete antichnykh istochnikov' in B.A. Litvinskii (ed.), *Vostochnyi Turkestan i Sredniĭa Azii v sisteme kul'tur drevnego i srednevekovogo Vostoka*, Moskva, 6–23.
- Piankov, I.V. 1987: 'Drevneĭshe antichnoe izvestie o puti v Vostochnyi Turkestan' in V.A. Ranov (ed.), *Proshloe Srednei Azii*, Dushanbe, 261–267.
- Piankov, I.V. 1997: *Sredniĭa Azii v antichnoi geograficheskoĭ traditsii*, Moskva.

- Piankov, I.V. 1996: 'The ethnic history of the Sakas' *BAI* 8, 37–46.
- Puri, B. 1974: 'The Nationality of the Kushans' in B. G. Gafurov, G. M. Bongard-Levin, E.A. Grantovsky, L.I. Miroshnikov, B.Y. Stavisky (eds.), *Central Asia in the Kushan Period: Proceedings of the International Conference on the History Archaeology and Culture of Central Asia in the Kushan Period (Dushanbe, September 27- October 6, 1968)*, Vol. 1., Moskva, 182–189.
- Staviskii, B.Ia. 1977: *Kushanskaia Baktriia: problemy istorii i kul'tury*, Moskva.
- Tarn, W.W. 1951: *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, Cambridge.
- Tomaschek, W. 1877: *Centralasiatische Studien. I. Sogdiana*, Wien.
- Tomaschek, W. 1883: *Zur historischen Topographie von Persien*, Wien.
- Umniakov, I. 1940: 'Tokharskaia problema' *VDI* 1940/3–4, 181–193.
- Vainberg, B.I. 1999: *Etnogeografiia Turana v drevnosti*, Moskva.

Abstract

The Tochari – Who are they?

In the article the author tries to explain contradictive information from different sources about the ancient people called the Tochari. He comes to the conclusion that initially the word 'Tochari' was the common noun (notion), meaning the structural part of a nomadic "empire", its sedentary factor. And only later this word became known as an ethnic notion.

Prof. Igor V. Piankov

Novgorodskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet im. Iaroslava Mudrogo
Gumanitarnyi Institut, Katedra vseobshchei istorii
Velikii Novgorod

Private address:
173024 Velikii Novgorod
Pr. Korsunova 51, kv. 7
Russian Federation
igor.pyankov@novsu.ru