

the Supiye, Supiya of Kharoṣṭhī documents of about the 3rd cent. A. D. (cf. BOYER, RAPSON, and SENART, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, 377-378, s. v. *supiya*, *supiyade*, *supiyana*, *supiyāna*, *supiye*, *supiye-hi*); three times (Nos. 119, 324, 722), the Supiya are mentioned alongside of Calmadāna, *i. e.* Cherchen (see « Ciarcian »), and the *suvarṇākara pa[rvati]yana* of No. 578, mentioned after *supiyana*, may perhaps be a *suvarṇākara parvata*, « Gold Mine Mountain », the 'Gold Mountain' of the 'Gold Race'. As also noticed by THOMAS, the same form Supiya occurs in Khotanese (the so-called 'Śaka'); cf. LEUMANN, *Nordar. Lehrged.*, pp. 208, 513; Sten KONOW, *Saka Studies*, 183. The very form So-byi, identical with Ch. *Suo-b'ji, is used in the Tibetan version of the *Prophecy of the Li country* (THOMAS, 78), probably made from the Khotanese. So we may hold it quite probable that such was the Khotanese name of the people whom the Tibetans knew as Sum-pa; the only qualification to that probably correct inference being that there are many names and terms in the said *Prophecy* which go back to Chinese originals, so that there is a remote possibility that the hitherto unique mention of So-byi may be based on Ch. Su-p'i (*Suo-b'ji) itself. The name Sum-pa occurs many times in various Tibetan texts, mostly without any epithet, but, in one paragraph of the *Inquiry of Vimalaprabhā*, as Ba-dag (or Ba-bdag) Sum-pa (THOMAS, 241-243), with a probable allusion to another name Ba-laṅ Sum-pa.

While we must be very grateful to THOMAS for the many texts he has rendered accessible, I must say quite frankly that I dissent from the identifications he has proposed. According to THOMAS, the Gold Country, or Country of the Gold Race, would be the region of Hunza and Nagar in the Kanjut (Kunjud) Valley, north of Gilgit, and the Gold Mountain might be the great Rakapushi itself (pp. 153-156, 165-166; but from the names possibly formed with *-dkar*, *-gar*, *-sgar*, suppress that of Pho-dkar, which is a late transcription of *Boḥar, Bokhara; see « Bucara »). The Supiya, Su-p'i or Sum-pa would be originally Hsiung-nu (Hūna, Huns), of Sien-pi origin, and the Sum-pa of Tibetan texts of the 8th-10th cents. would be « really Hūnas or quasi-Hūnas », Su-p'i and Sum-pa being fundamentally the same name as Sien-pi. As these Hunnic Sum-pa were great marauders, their name remained attached to other tribes which used to make incursions upon Khotan, such as the Qarluq Turks. As to the Ba-dag Sum-pa, they would be people of Badaḥšān, who, on account of their marauding habits, may « have a real identity of name with the Tibetan Sum-pas, who were actually, like the Tu-yuk-hun [T'u-yü-hun], of Sien-pi origin » (THOMAS, pp. 9-10, 156-159).

Although many points are still far from being elucidated, the ethnical and geographical data of the Tibetan and Chinese texts are often clear enough, and, in my opinion, cannot be reconciled with the views expressed by THOMAS. Both series of sources are in closer agreement than has been hitherto admitted. The prophecies are concerned with the decline and fall of Buddhism in Central Asia, and that of Saṅghavardhana says (THOMAS, p. 61) that « the monks of 'An-ce, Gus-tig, Parmkhan, and Šu-lig, after great sufferings, will go to the Bru-ša (= Bru-ža) land (= Baltistan). Also the monks of the Tho-kar (= Tokharestan, Tūḥaristān) and of Kashmir, having been vexed by unbelieving people, will give up and go to the Bru-ša country ». This retrospective prophecy refers in fact to the advance of the Mussulmans. « Šu-lig » is admittedly Kāšgar, and this Tibetan form is a rendering of the Chinese name Shu-lo (*Ši'wo-lək; see « Cascar »). Instead of 'An-ce (*c = ts*), the *Prophecy of the Li country* more correctly gives 'An-se (THOMAS, pp. 77, 78, 82); THOMAS rejects ROCKHILL's identification with 安西 An-hsi, because he believes this An-hsi to be the modern An-hsi