

NINGHAM, but neither its original form, nor that of San-po-ho, has been restored with certainty. Yet, Hsüan-tsang's transcription Mo-lo-so can be based only on *Mrā-sa, *Mar-sa or *Marāsa, and I think that the balance weighs in favour of A. H. FRANCKE's hypothesis (*JRAS*, 1908, 189), according to which the original name would be Tib. *Mar-sa, « Low-land ». For San-po-ho, VIVIEN DE SAINT-MARTIN's assertion (in JULIEN, *Mém.*, II, 334) that « it certainly represents Champāka, which is the Sanskrit form of Chamba » is egregiously erroneous. ROCKHILL (*The Land of the Lamas*, 340) has stated without any qualification that it was « Yaru tsang-po », *i. e.* the upper Brahmaputra. This, coming from a man who knew some Chinese, can be explained only by confusion between 訶 *ho*, a character of transcription, and 河 *ho*, « river », the remaining *san-po* being taken as the equivalent of « tsang-po ». The curious fact is that a similar solution has been proffered from a non-sinological side: FRANCKE (*JRAS*, 1908, 189) says that San-po-ho « is the Chinese attempt to represent *γtsang-po*, 'river', this being the ordinary name of the Indus in Ladakh ». But *Sām-puā-χâ supposes an original *Sampāha, which can have nothing to do either with *gcañ-po* itself, or with a sanskritized form based on *gcañ-po*. THOMAS (*Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 149) speaks of the « Sampaha and the other three Śākya youths, connected with Śāmbī, Udyāna, Himatala, and Bāmiān », and, on p. 152, in reference to the location of Suvarṇagotra, unreservedly gives « Sam-pa-ha (Śāmbī) ». But I know of no Śākya called « Sampaha ». ROCKHILL, *Life of the Buddha*, 118, to whom THOMAS gives a reference, actually speaks of « King Shampaka », not « Sampaha ». As to « Śāmbī », which THOMAS took from BEAL (*Buddhist Records*, II, 21), who himself copied JULIEN (*Mém.*, I, 318), it is an erroneous restoration. The text says that the four Śākya became respectively kings of Uḍḍiyāna, *Bāmyana (Bamyān, Bāmiyān), Himatala (< Hephtalites), and 商彌 Shang-mi. Shang-mi, restored by JULIEN into *Śāmbī, can render only *Śyānmī (< *Śyāmī) or *Śānmī (< *Sāmī). As a matter of fact, the name is also written Shē-mi, which is either *Śyāmī or *Sāmī, and Hui-ch'ao says that its king was called *Śyāmarāja (or *Sāmarāja); *Śyāmī seems to me to be more probable. But the main fact is that this country is well known and does not at all correspond to Ladakh. It is Chitral, to the north-west of the Indus (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 129; FUCHS, *Huei-ch'ao's Pilgerreise*, 447), and there is not the slightest possibility that it should be connected with *Sampāha. So the name remains unaccounted for, and we must be content with the admission that *Sampāha, *alias* *Mar-sa, which was at the western frontier of Suvarṇagotra, is Ladakh. To account for the double name, we might suppose that *Mar-sa (sanskritized to *Marāsa ?) was the form used in Kashmir, while *Sampāha, heard in Kulūta, would be the Kulūta name of Ladakh.

The question of 羊同 Yang-t'ung (*Jang-d'ung) is no less obscure. The original form is likely to be Tibetan, but remains unknown. One might think of one of the Tibetan names ending in *gdoñ*, « face » (cf. BEFEO, v, 291); and, from the phonetic point of view, *gYañ-gdoñ, « Auspicious Faces », or Yañs-gdoñ, « Broad Faces », would be quite satisfactory, but, as far as I know, no such name is attested. Hui-ch'ao writes the name 楊同 Yang-t'ung (FUCHS, 443, 445), which is phonetically identical; both characters *yang* were interchangeable in proper names during the T'ang dynasty (cf. BEFEO, IV, 370, 1100-1103). The *Shih-chia fang-chih* says that Suvarṇagotra was the same as Ta Yang-t'ung, 'Great Yang-t'ung', and it is a fact that T'ang texts speak of a 'Great Yang-t'ung' (Ta Yang-t'ung) and a 'Lesser Yang-t'ung' (Hsiao Yang-t'ung).

The only special notice on Yang-t'ung occurs in *T'ung tien*, 190, 5 b (cf. BUSHELL, in *JRAS*,