

one would like to find elsewhere some confirmation of the fact that *ghar* was more or less known in the region towards the middle of the 18th cent. Whatever the case may be, neither Pers. *kāshī*, nor Mong. *gār* or Hindī *ghar* can actually be the source of the name « Kāšyar ».

VIVIEN DE SAINT-MARTIN's remark (in JULIEN, *Mémoires*, II, 427) that « *gar* is the common ending of a great number of place-names in the dialects of northern India, with the meaning 'city' » has been simply repeated by FRANKE (*SPAW*, 1903, 186, who erroneously credits JULIEN with it), but is ignored by STEIN, and rightly, I believe; the name has no chance of being Indian. THOMAS (*Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 166) also speaks of « *gar* », which is « perhaps fundamentally the same as Tibetan *sgar*, *gar*, 'encampment' » and « was, no doubt, widely used in Tibeto-Burman dialects »; Kāšyar is one of the names adduced. I am afraid that much of THOMAS's list must be left out, for instance « rGya-gar », India, « Pho-dkar », which I believe to be Bokhara, and « Kāšyar » itself.

RICHTOFEN's attempt at explaining the first part of « Kāšyar » from the Turk. *qaš*, « jade », was opposed by STEIN (*loc. cit.* 50), who however, like RICHTOFEN, felt inclined to connect with *qaš* the name of the *Κάσια ὄρη*. STEIN's opinion was that the name of the *qaš* stone may have come to the Greeks from the Great Yüeh-chih « who probably spoke a language of the Turki-Mongolian family ». MARQUART, on the other hand, saw in *qaš* the outcome of « an old *vrddhi*-form **khāsa* = stone from the Khaśa or *Κασία* land » (*Wehröt und der Fluss Arang*, 68; *Ueber das Volkstum der Komanen*, 201). HERRMANN (art. « Kasia » in PAULY-WISSOWA) repeats MARQUART's etymology *Khāsa* > *qaš*, and considers as established that the *Κάσια ὄρη* owed their name to *qaš*, jade (cf. also my remarks in *TP*, 1930, 299, and HERRMANN, *Das Land der Seide und Tibet*, 141-142). I do not believe in the Turco-Mongolian appurtenance of the Great Yüeh-chih, nor do I think it probable that *qaš* is derived from **khāsa*. It would rather appeal to me simply to connect Khaśa and the *Κάσια ὄρη*. As to the word *qaš*, it occurs for the first time in 1076 in Kāšyarī (BROCKELMANN, 150); but its earlier history is still unknown (see also « Cotan »).

BURNOUF had the intuition of what I believe to be partly the true etymology of the name « Kāšyar », when he suggested to HUMBOLDT **Khaśagairi*, « Hill of the Khaśa » (cf. STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 50-51). Not that I think that *kāš-* has anything to do with Khaśa, but the second half of the word seems to me to have the greatest probability of corresponding to Skr. *giri*, Avest. *gairi*, Khotan. *gari*, Wakh. *yar*, Yayn. *gor* < **gar*. This may even be what Hui-lin meant when he rendered **Kašgiri* in Chinese as « Garrison of the Onion Range » instead of « Garrison of Shu-lo ». A natural inference would be to look also into the languages of the Pamir for a word meaning « onion » as the first component of **Kašgiri*. It just happens that the word for « onion » is *kašu* in Šhiṇ'a, *yašu* in Burušaski (cf. LORIMER, *The Burushaski Language*, III, 182). But these are not Iranian languages, and they have no word resembling *gairi*, *giri*, for « mountain ». Hui-lin's gloss is not bound to give us the literal sense of the whole name, and I prefer to consider the first element of **Kašgiri* as still undetermined.

But, alongside of **Kašgiri*, a short form based only on the first element seems to have been current in Sogdian. This is at least the conclusion we must accept if, as appears very probable, Kāše is to be understood as < Kāšak and means « of Kāšyar », « Kāshgarian », while the Q's'nč = Kāšānč of *Mahrnāmag*, line 146, would represent its feminine form (cf. HENNING, in