

Ou-k'ong found in the kingdom more than three hundred monasteries or Vihāras, nine of which are distinctly named in the Itinerary (*Journal Asiatique*, p. 354). But none of these have yet been identified.

The first in the list is the monastery of *Moung-ti'* in which Ou-k'ong appears chiefly to have pursued his studies. Its Sanskrit name was *Moung-ti-wei-houo-lo* which is re-transcribed by the editors into *Mundi-vihāra*. The Itinerary clearly indicates the identity of *Wei-houo-lo* with the term *Vihāra* and further informs us that this monastery was built by the King of Northern India after he had obtained the dignity'. That the signs *Moung-ti* are intended to represent the name of this king, can be shown from twofold evidence.

In the account of Gandhāra which follows immediately after that of Kaçmīr, the Itinerary, p. 356, mentions a number of monasteries founded there by members of the royal family descended from Kaniška or by relatives of the king of the Turks (*Tou-kiue*). With reference to these establishments we are distinctly told that each of them had received its name from the founder.

Though no express statement of this kind is found with reference to the Kaçmīr monasteries, yet we find among the names of the latter designations exactly corresponding to, or identical with, those used for the Gandhāra Vihāras. Thus we have in both lists a monastery of the *K'o-toen* who is described as the queen of the Turks. The Editors are unquestionably right in recognizing in this name the well-known Turkish title *Kātūn* which is borne by the Khān's wife. Again both lists mention monasteries founded by the son of the king of Turks': they are designated as the monasteries of *Yeli-te-le* and *T'e-k'in-li*, respectively, both names evidently representing, as assumed by the Editors, Turkish titles for younger members of the ruling family. In view of these coincidences the assumption seems justified that the same system of nomenclature for religious establishments prevailed in both countries, and that

---

*Indian Antiquary*, II, p. 106. The exact extent of this adjustment cannot be determined without fresh evidence, independent of Kalhaṇa's statements as to the lengths of the individual reigns, the accuracy of which we have at present no means of testing.