

question is still obscure, because Sogdian texts mentioning *Bärmän are still unpublished (cf. BAILEY, 568), because there is in Kāšyārī a name Barhan, the value of which is not perfectly clear, because the بنجول B.nčūl of Gardēzī and the *Hudūd-al-Ālam* (cf. *Mi*, 294) may be altered from بخون *Bārhwān, because the -m- of Tib. Par-mkhan, though in principle a mute letter (*par-mkhan* exists in Tibetan with the meaning of « printer », and this may have determined the spelling in the proper name), is disturbing in the present case, and finally because Uč (so called in the *Hudūd-al-Ālam*, 295, and in Kāšyārī, 251), our « Uch-Turfan », was known as Uč-Färmän in the late Middle Ages (cf. *Br*, II, 45, 227, 230; in fact, as far as I know, this form occurs only in Šārāfu-'d-Dīn's *Zāfār-nāmāh* [*Bibl. Indica* ed., I, 255, 488; I have not had access to Nižām-i Šāmi's *Zāfār-nāmāh*]; « Outchferman » on DELISLE's maps of 1706 and 1723 may be taken from PETIS DE LA CROIX's translation [when this translation was still in Ms.], and STRAHLENBERG's « Utschferment » [1730] may be copied from DELISLE; the « Turfan » of « Uch-Turfan » is a fairly late addition, occurring also as « Turpan » and « Turman »; I wish I were sure that « Uč-Färmän » is not an erroneous form instead of Uč-Turmän). But, in spite of all these minor points, the identity of Par-mkhan and Po-huan cannot be doubted.

Such a close agreement between the nomenclature of the Tibetan prophecies and the Chinese texts almost implies also a great analogy in the traditions of the two series of texts concerning the 'Gold Race' and the Su-p'i or Sum-pa. Former research considered that either Hsüan-tsang or the author of the *Hsin T'ang shu* had unduly mixed up a 'Kingdom of Women' to the east or south-east of Tibet with the Suvarṇagotra, or Gold Race, of the north-west of Tibet. But the confusion, if any such existed, ought to be ascribed to a still earlier date, since the *Sui shu*, the information of which is anterior to, and independant of that of Hsüan-tsang, already says that, in the 'Kingdom of Women', the woman king had the surname of Su-p'i, *i. e.* belonged to the Su-p'i clan, and that her husband was called Chin-chü, « Gold-gathering ». *Chü* means « to collect » and « a gathering »; it may even be used here as an equivalent of 聚落 *chü-lo*, « village ». In spite of the vagueness of the term, ROCKHILL (*The Land of the Lamas*, 339) was certainly right when he connected it with Suvarṇagotra, the country of the « Gold Race », so called, according to Hsüan-tsang, on account of the superior gold it produced. So it was no confusion on the part of Hsüan-tsang when the pilgrim said that the Suvarṇagotra was the same as the 'Eastern Kingdom of Women', and gave on the latter country details which are taken almost verbatim from the *Sui shu* itself, or from the same account as that used in the *Sui shu*. The new name 'Eastern Kingdom of Women', while the *Sui shu* merely has 'Kingdom of Women', must not deceive us. The modern editors of the *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi* have thought (cf. above, p. 711) that it lay in eastern or south-eastern Tibet, and was so named in contradistinction with the one south of the Onion Range which would be the 'Western Kingdom of Women'. But this is a certain error. Hsüan-tsang expressly says that the name 'Eastern Kingdom of Women' was meant to distinguish the Suvarṇagotra from another 'Kingdom of Women' in the Western Sea, *i. e.* the legendary one conterminous with the Byzantine Empire which will be discussed in a later section of the present inquiry. The same name 'Eastern Kingdom of Women', with the same explanation of its origin as in Hsüan-tsang's text, occurs not only in the *Hsin T'ang shu*, which draws so largely from the account of the pilgrim for countries to the west and south-west of China, but also in the *Chiu T'ang shu*, generally