

from the Su-p'i, the T'u-yü-hun, and the Yang-t'ung, the Su-p'i always heading the list (cf. *Hsin T'ang shu*, 216 B, 7 a).

It will be noticed that, while the *Hsin T'ang shu* speaks of « Hsi-no » in the paragraph devoted to the Su-p'i, it gives « Hsi-no-lo » in the chapter on the Tibetans. The second form is the correct one, and *lo* has certainly been omitted by error in the passage which gives « Hsi-no ». Moreover, in the T'ang itinerary to Lhasa, the Stage of Hsi-no-lo certainly contains the same name. Since it was to the north or north-east of the Hu-mang Gorge, and consequently within the territory of the Su-p'i, it is probable that it derived its name from that of the prince; and, if so, the Stage of Hsi-no-lo was probably not established before c. 755, and this is in agreement with the date which I assign to the itinerary. On the other hand, while some hesitation is possible about the Tibetan connection of the names and titles of the Kingdom of Women (*pin-chiu*, *kao-pa*, etc.), no doubt can be entertained about Mo-ling-tsan and Hsi-no-lo. Mo-ling-tsan (\*Muät-ljäng-tsân) seems to render 'Briñ-bcan. As for Hsi-no-lo (\*Sjět-nâk-lâ), it must be remembered that, for a reason still unknown (perhaps a dialectal Chinese pronunciation), *no* (\*nâk) renders *tag* of Tibetan names in T'ang times (cf. *TP*, 1915, 8, confirmed by more recent research); the original is almost certainly Stag-sgra « Tiger-voice », a name well attested in Tibetan.

Before attempting to discuss the geographical and historical value of all these texts, something must be said about the 三波訶 San-po-ho of Hsüan-tsang and the 大羊同 'Great Yang-t'ung' of the *Shih-chia fang-chih*, and the kingdom of Hsi-li.

San-po-ho (\*Sâm-puâ-χâ) occurs in Chinese literature only in Hsüan-tsang, who says that Suvar-nagotra, *alias* the Eastern Kingdom of Women, borders to the west on San-po-ho, and in the *Shih-chia fang-chih* and the *Hsin T'ang shu*, where it has been taken from Hsüan-tsang. In a former section, speaking of the region of the upper Sutlej, Hsüan-tsang had devoted notices to Jālandhara (闍爛達羅 Chê-lan-ta-lo), Kulūta (屈露多 Ch'ü-lu-to), Śatadru (設多圖廬 Shê-to-t'u-lu), etc. In the notice on Kulūta (north of the Sutlej and reaching the southern slopes of the Himālaya, the modern Kulu or Kullu), there is the following digression : « From there, going north for 1.800 or 1.900 *li*, the road is very dangerous, crossing mountains and passing valleys, and [then] one arrives at the Kingdom of 洛護羅 Lo-hu-lo (\*Lâk-γuo-lâ). From there to the north, for over 2.000 *li*, the road is very difficult, with cold wind and flying snow, and one arrives, at the kingdom of 秣邏娑 Mo-lo-so (\*Muât-lâ-sâ). » An original note to the text adds : « [Mo-lo-so] is also called 三波訶 San-po-ho » (cf. JULIEN, *Mém.*, I, 205). The passage has been copied into the *Shih-chia fang-chih* (*loc. cit.*, 93 b), but, while the Lo-hu-lo is stated to belong to « northern India », a note expressly says that Mo-lo-so « is not within the precincts of India ».

Lo-hu-lo, which supposes a Sanskritized form \*Laghūla of a native non-Sanskrit name, has been correctly identified with Lahul; but CUNNINGHAM was mistaken in believing that Lahul represented a Tibetan name Lho-yul, « Southern Land » (cf. WATTERS, I, 299); Hsüan-tsang heard the name in Kulūta, and, even now, Lahul is used only by the people of Kulu (cf. A. H. FRANCKE, in *JRAS*, 1908, 189). I do not preclude the possibility that the same name may occur in that of the fortress of Lahūr or Lauhūr in Al-Bīrūnī (SACHAU, I, 208, 317), and in the pseudo-« Kulutalahāḍa » (? read « Kuluta, \*Lahoḍa ») of the same writer (SACHAU, I, 302).

Mo-lo-so, since it lay north of Lahul, can hardly be anything but Ladakh, as asserted by CUN-