

in western Kan-su, and says it is Bokhara. It is true that Bokhara was known as the kingdom of 安 An c. 600 A. D., and then erroneously thought to be the kingdom of 安息 An-hsi (*Ân-sjæk) of Han times, which was in fact the Arsacid or Parthian empire, and the name of which rendered Arsak (I do not believe in the derivation of An-hsi from «Antiochia [Margiana]», Merv., recently advocated by W. W. TARN, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 281); and in the administrative nomenclature established in 658 through a misapplication of ancient names, Bokhara became the district of An-hsi (*Ân-sjæk; cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 136-137). On the other hand, in the Chinese translation made by Fa-ch'êng of the *Prophecy of the Li country* (cf. PELLIOT and HANEDA's edition, in *Manuscrits de Touen-houang*, Kyôto, 1926, No. 2), the 'An-se of the Tibetan text is rendered by the An-hsi (*Ân-sjæk) of the Arsacid empire. Yet, I have little doubt that Fa-ch'êng made a mistake. If he adopted An-hsi (*Ân-sjæk), it must be on account of a literary reminiscence, because, in much older « prophecies », the Parthian king was one of the three wicked monarchs who were to endanger and almost ruin the Buddhist law. In the *Prophecy of the Li country*, the conditions, and the names are on the contrary those of middle T'ang times, when the « An-hsi district » of Bokhara was a pseudo-administrative designation which never came into actual use. Moreover, occlusive final consonants were still heard in the 9th cent., and, just as Shu-lo (*Şi^wo-læk) gave in Tibetan Šu-lig, An-hsi (*Ân-sjæk) ought to be rendered not 'An-se, but *'An-sig. As was said by ROCKHILL, 'An-se actually is 安西 An-si (*Ân-siei), but not the An-hsi of western Kan-su, an administrative name which dates only from the Man-chu dynasty; what ROCKHILL alluded to, though misplacing its seat, is the « Protectorate General of An-hsi », i. e. Kučā in Chinese Turkestan, which certainly is the 'An-tse, or better 'An-se, of the two prophecies; Russian Turkestan is out of the question. The same may be said of Gus-tig, for which LAUFER had thought of Kučā, but which THOMAS states to be « Hon-tö » (read « Hou-tê ») of *TP*, 1905, 559, N. E. of Samarkand. But Hou-tê was a name of the Han period, no more known in the 9th cent., and here again the scope of the prophecy remains within the limits of Chinese Turkestan : Gus-tig certainly is the place situated between « Aksu » (Aq-su) and Maral-baši (almost at Maral-baši) the name of which is written 據史德 Chü-shih-tê (*Kj^wo-si-tæk) in Chia Tan's itineraries (*Hsin T'ang shu*, 43 B, 14 b), 據瑟得 Chü-shê-tê (*Kj^wo-şet-tæk) in Wu-k'ung's itinerary (cf. CHAVANNES and LÉVI, in *JA*, 1895, II, 363), and, erroneously, 握瑟德 Wo-shê-tê (*Âk-şet-tæk) in Kao Hsien-chih's biography (cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 152). Nor is Par-mkhan « Ferghana » (Faryāna), as stated by THOMAS (pp. 47, 61). It renders 撥換 Po-huan (*Puât-yuân; to CHAVANNES' texts, add *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, 986, 23 a, and *Hsin T'ang shu*, 216 A, 3a), also written 鉢浣 Po-huan (*Puât-yuân; cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 8, 353) and 鉢換 Po-huan (*Puât-yuân; cf. *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, 992, 7 a), which I have shown many years ago to render the name by which what is now Aq-su (« Aksu » of our maps) was anciently known to Mussulman writers (cf. *TP*, 1907, 553-556; 1923, 129-130; 1936, 362). I had started from Idrisi's باخوان Bāḫwān; since an Iranian form Parvān is now attested (cf. *Mi*, 482; BAILEY, in *BSOS*, IX, 567-568; I have now discarded the connection with Mo-lu [see « Cotton », p. 494-495]), BAILEY has proposed to correct Idrisi's form, always uncertain, to باروان *Bārwan; but the Tibetan Par-mkhan also has a -ḫ- (-kh-), so that I am tempted to restore in Idrisi's باخوان *Barḫwān (= *Parḫwān), as a doublet of Parvān. On the other hand, MINORSKY (*Mi*, 295) has suggested that Idrisi's Bāḫwān may have to be corrected into بارمان Bārmān, which seems to be another name of Aq-su in Kāşyārī (BROCKELMANN, 241). The