

It is that name Kāšyar which appears in the *Hsin T'ang shu* in the form Chia-shih, but this is an apocopated rendering which we can trace back to its full form. In the account of the travels in India of 慧超 Hui-ch'ao which I brought back from the Tun-huang caves, it is said that Hui-ch'ao, in 727, arrived at « Shu-lo, the native name of which in foreign countries is 伽師祇離 Ch'ieh-shih-ch'i-li (\*G'ia-ši-g'jiē-ljiē »); cf. *Tripit.* of Taishō, 51, 979. Hui-ch'ao's work, of which we have only this incomplete and sometimes faulty manuscript, has been briefly commented upon by 慧琳 Hui-lin (737-820), himself a Kāshgarian, in his *I-ch'ie ching yin-i* completed in 817 (ch. 100; *Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, x, 104 b). There the name of Kāšyar is written 迦師佉梨 Chia-shih-chi-li (\*Ka-ši-g'jēt-liei), and I have no doubt that Hui-lin has preserved the correct form, at least as far as the first character is concerned. It is indirectly confirmed by the apocopated form which is given in the *Hsin T'ang shu* and which probably comes from Hui-ch'ao's account. Hui-lin adds that it is a 胡 Hu (at that time generally = Iranian) name, and that the Chinese (« T'ang ») name for it is 蔥嶺鎮 Ts'ung-ling-chên, « Garrison of the Ts'ung-ling ». Kāšyar was one of the « Four Garrisons » of the T'ang in Turkestan, although it had already been lost to China when Hui-lin wrote his commentary; and it was the « Garrison » which was particularly intended to protect the Ts'ung-ling or « Onion Range ». Hui-ch'ao uses « Ts'ung-ling-chên » in a general way, but I do not think that there has ever been such an official name, and Hui-lin may have meant to give an explanation of \*Kašgiri, not its equivalence with Shu-lo already expressed in Hui-ch'ao's text. The more so since, at the end of the subsisting portion of Hui-ch'ao's account, we find a list of the « Four Garrisons » where that of Kāšyar appears under its ordinary Chinese name Shu-lo.

Ch'ieh-shih-ch'i-li or Chia-shih-chi-li must evidently be restored as \*Kašgiri, and this text of 727 provides us with the earliest mention of the very name « Kāšyar »; we have seen above, however, that it must then have been in existence for more than a century. Various attempts have been made to explain it. The one quoted by CORDIER (*Y*, I, 183), according to which Kāšyar is formed of « *kash*, fine colour, and *gar*, brick house », is the one started in 1763 by the compilers of the *Hsi-yü t'ung-wên chih* (III, 13-15), who write the name Qašiqar in Mongolian, but Qašqār in Turkī, and go on by saying that, in Turkī, \**qaši* means « motley », and \**qar*, « brick-house ». WATTERS (*On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, II, 292) commented on the Chinese explanation. According to him, « there is a Turkī word *Kasha* (or *Kashka*) which means 'variously coloured', but *gar*, in Mongolian *ger*, stands perhaps for the Chinese interpretation of the Hindu word *ghar* which means 'a house'. But there is no word *kaša* meaning « variously coloured » in any Turkish dialect, and *qašqa* (also *qačqa*, *qasqa*; *qašya* in Kāšyarī) is only used for piebald animals. I think that, in spite of the « Mongolized » spelling (see *infra*) adopted in Turkī by Ch'ien-lung's Commissioners for the name of Kāšyar, they were given a « pandit's » etymology actually based on the true *k*-initial, and that their \**qaši* is the Pers. کاشی *kāshī*, « enamelled brick ». \**Qar*, « brick-house », is unknown too in Turkī. One may think of Mong. *gār*, « house » (but not « brick-house »), but *gār* can of course have nothing to do with Hindī *ghar* (< Prākṛit *ghara*; cf. Skr. *grha*), « house ». Since Mong. *gār* is not of the same « class » as *-qar* (*-yar*) of Qašqar, Kāšyar, and also for want of a suitable word either in Turkī or in Persian, I incline to the view that the word meant by « brick-house » may be the Hindī *ghar*, carried to Kāšyar by Hindu traders; but