

*Hsin T'ang shu* who, under the influence of phonetic analogy, duplicated the name which they found in Hsüan-tsang for Kāšyar). Hsüan-tsang's notice, in this case as in many others, has been taken over by the compilers of the *Hsin T'ang shu*, who say that Shu-lo (Kāšyar) was also called Ch'ieh-sha, but add that the king resided in the city of 迦師 Chia-shih (\*Ka-ši); cf. CHAVANNES, *ibid.* 121 (the 迦瑟 Chia-sê in STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 66, is a slip; Chia-sê is quite another name, which just comes before Chia-shih in the Index of CHAVANNES's book, p. 336). STEIN (*loc. cit.* 48) says that in Ch'ieh-sha «it is impossible to mistake the phonetic rendering of some form connected with the present Kāshgar», and that the name of the capital Chia-shih «is evidently also closely related in origin». But I doubt that there should be any original connection between Ch'ieh-sha and Chia-shih.

The original of Ch'ieh-sha, Khaṣa, is perfectly plain; it is the name so frequently found in Indian texts in the form Khaśa, Khasa, Khaṣa, as a designation of a number of hill-tribes of the Himalayan regions. Already in the 18th cent., scholars connected the name with Ptolemy's *Kάσια ὄρη*; nowadays, the Khakha tribes to the west and north-west of Kashmir are Khasa; the Gurkhas of Nepal call themselves Khas and their language is known under the name of the Khas language as well as under that of Parbatiya (STEIN, *Ancien Khotan*, 50-51; LÉVI, in *BEFEO*, iv, 556). BURNOUF had thought of connecting the name of the Khaśa with that of Kāšyar. STEIN is right in his objection that Kāšyar is far from the ordinary seats of the Khaśa tribes, but the fact is that a moment came when the equivalence Khaśa or Khaṣa = Kāšyar became current in Central Asia. As I have said above, the original word of the *Avataṃsaka* which was rendered Shu-lo (Kāšyar) in the translation of 696-699 must have been Khaśa; but the earlier translation of the 5th cent. rendered the same name with a vague 邊夷 *pien-i*, «Barbarians of the frontier», and a parallel text of the *Sūryagarbha*, translated c. 600, gave Yü-tien, Khotan; the Tibetan version of the *Sūryagarbha* specifies that Khotan was in the land of the Khaśa (cf. LÉVI, in *BEFEO*, iv, 546-547, 556). In the list of *yakṣa* of the *Mahāmāyūrī*, the name of the land of Khaśa is simply transcribed 迦舍 Chia-shê (\*Ka-śja) in the translation of the beginning of the 6th cent. (due to a bad phonetician), but is rendered Shu-lo (Kāšyar) in the translation of I-ching (705) and half a century later by Amoghavajra (cf. LÉVI, in *JA*, 1915, I, 52, 102). This equivalence did not originate with Hsüan-tsang, since in the list of writings of the *Lalitavistara*, the translation of 587 transcribes Khaṣa as 珂沙 K'o-sha (\*K'â-ṣa), but adds that it is Shu-lo, Kāšyar (cf. LÉVI, in *BEFEO*, iv, 575; the translation of 308 transcribes 佉沙 Ch'ieh-sha and that of 683 可索 K'o-so [\*K'â-sâk], both without translation). The form used in the translation of 308 shows that Hsüan-tsang was not the first to use those two characters for Khaṣa. I think it is even more ancient than 308, and goes back to the version of the *āgama* made in the 3rd cent. (cf. NANJIO, No. 547; and the quotation in ch. 43 of the *Fa-yüan chu-lin*).

While the name of the Khaṣa often occurs in Chinese translations from the 3rd cent. onwards, we have so far no indication that it was brought into connection with Kāšyar before the end of the 6th cent. The new identification was evidently not due to purely geographical or historical reasons, but must have been suggested by phonetic analogy between the names. The inference may be drawn that the name «Kāšyar», the first part of which resembles Khaśa, Khaṣa, is perhaps not much older than A. D. 600.