

Prākṛit form of *suvarṇa*, «gold» (for -s- and -ś-, cf. *soma* «moon», given as the original of a \**śūma*<sup>0</sup> or \**śoma*<sup>0</sup>, *ibid.* 1038; and for -m- and -v- cf. a \**suman*<sup>0</sup> interpreted as «gold» *suvarṇa*, *ibid.*, 1039). We can establish from another source that \**Khara-Śyāmāka* must be abandoned. As remarked by THOMAS (*loc. cit.* 93), the Tibetan translation, in the passage corresponding to the text of the *Sūryagarbha* which mentions Chia-lo-sha-mo, gives rDo-rcub «Hardstone», clearly representing an original *Kharāśman*. THOMAS adds that possibly there is some relation between the name *Kharāśman* and that of the sage Kha-ra-śva (*Kharāśva*); moreover, he is inclined to connect these names with that of Hwārizm. I do not feel much inclined to accept the second hypothesis; and I have no doubt that the first one is correct. *Kharāśva* and *Kharāśman* (*Kharāśma*) are in fact one and the same name, and we have only here one more case of the confusion between -śva- and śma- to which we owe the double forms *aśvagarbha* and *aśmagarbha*, *Aśvaparānta* and *Aśmāparānta*. They may be due to the hesitation of Buddhist compilers when rendering into Sanskrit Prākṛit forms in -ssa- (cf. *BEFEO*, iv, 379; *JASB*, 1925, 48-51). Whatever the case may be, the various texts concerning \**Kharoṣṭra* (\**Kharoṣṭrag*) and \**Kharāśman* provide an interesting example of the way in which, in the first centuries of our era, traditional names which had perhaps quite a different value originally became connected with Chinese Turkestan, with occasional precise references to Khotan and even to Kāśyar.

The name of Shu-lo has been adduced by MARQUART (*Erānšahr*, 282-284; cf. also STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, I, 56) to explain the name of the convent of the kingdom of Kapiśī which is said in Hsüan-tsang's *Life* (JULIEN, *Vie*, 71) to have been built when a son of the Chinese Emperor was there as a hostage, and which was known under the name of 沙落迦 *Sha-lo-chia* (\**Ṣa-lāk-ka*). But, at the same time, MARQUART saw in *Sha-lo-chia*, restored as *Šaraka*, a name of the Chinese. The apparent contradiction seems to have been solved, in MARQUART's mind, by his idea that the name, to be read as \**Šāraka*, originally meant «Prince of Kāśyar», but in Hsüan-tsang's time was misunderstood as meaning «Chinese». As a matter of fact, the contradiction is in the names themselves. The name of Sarag, Skr. *Saraga*, is now well attested as that of Lo-yang, the eastern capital of the Han and the T'ang, but *Sha-lo-chia* can only be \**Šāraka* or \**Šālaka*; to obtain the name of China, or of Lo-yang, we ought to correct 沙 *sha* to 莎 *so* (\**suā*) or rather to 娑 *so* (\**sā*). If we retain *Sha-lo-chia* and connect it with the form *Sha-lo* used by Buddhist pilgrims for Shu-lo, \**Šāraka* will hold good, but then the difficulty is that the *Life* speaks of a son of the Chinese Emperor, not of a son of the king of Kāśyar. I still hesitate between the two solutions (cf. my remarks in *JA*, 1927, II, 139-141, and also *Mi*, 225; MINORSKY's objection to the surprising transcription of *g* or *gh* as ǰ by early Arab writers may perhaps be answered by supposing that the Arab transcription is based on \**Sarak*). I do not believe in MARQUART's \**Šārakavati*.

I should perhaps feel more inclined to accept \**Šāraka* as a form derived from Shu-lo or Sha-lo if we knew more about this name (MARQUART's restoration as \**Šārak* in *Wehröt und der Fluss Arang*, 68, is possible, but not proved). It occurs in Tibetan texts of about the 10th cent. as *Šu-lig* (cf. THOMAS, in STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 581, 582), or sometimes *Šu-leg* (THOMAS, *Tibetan Texts and Documents*, 118), but these appear to be forms merely borrowed from the Ch. Shu-lo. BAILEY (*BSOS*, VIII, 883) says that *Sūlya* «seems, in a document from the Khotan region, to mean the people of Kāśyar». We must wait until we know more about it, since the initial is neither