

BSOS, ix, 566-567). In the modern work *Hsin-mao shih-hsing chi* (5, 22 a) it is said that nowadays the Turks of Kāšyar often call the town in an abbreviated form K'o-shih (i. e. \*Qaš or \*Qaši?); this is adduced to explain the «short» forms Ch'ieh-sha (Khaša) and Chia-shih of the T'ang period. But the author, who went from Tientsin to Urumči in 1891 never visited Kāšyar, and I hold the modern abbreviated form, which I never heard on the spot, to be artificial.

STEIN says (*Ancient Khotan*, 47, 48) that, in Mohammedan works, the name Kāšyar occurs in different spellings : كاشغر Kāšyar, كاشغر Kāšgar, كاشكر Kāškar, قاشقر Qāšqar, «in accordance with the phonetic latitude allowed by Turkī languages in respect of certain consonants». But we must keep in mind that the spelling Kāšyar is the one used in Arabic by Ibn Al-Aθir, in Persian by the author of the *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, in Turkish by the author of the *Qutaḍyu bilig* and by Kāšyarī, that is to say by the most ancient sources. Forms like Kāškar, Kāšgar and Qāšqar, when they are not misreadings (few mss. distinguish between *k* and *g*, and *-q-* is easily confused with *-γ-*), far from being the result of a «phonetic latitude» in Turkish, are more likely to be the result of the general reluctance to have in Turkish or Mongolian, in the same word, sounds of different classes like *k* (or *g*) and *q* (or *γ*). On the other hand, changes between *k* and *q* or *h* are common in Persian. In the beginning of the 14th cent., Abū-'l-Fidā gives the two spellings Qāšyar and Kāšyar, but all the ancient quotations given in his notice only have Kāšyar (REINAUD, *Géogr. d'Aboulféda*, Arabic text, 504-505; transl. II, II, 229-230). Secondary forms كاشغر Kāčyar and كاشغر Kāžyar are quoted by VULLERS (II, 772) from the *Burhan-i Qāṭi*. I do not know any instance of «Kāčyar», which may be only due to the influence of the sonant *γ* on the preceding *š*. But «Kāčyar» is attested at an early date in an adjective of origin Kāšyarī (? or Kāčyarī). The father of the first historian of Kāšyar, who outlived his son by ten years and died in 1093, was called Ḥusain al-Alma'i al Qāšyarī (cf. BARTHOLD, «*Qāshghar*», in *EI*). I have no theory to offer to explain «Kāčyar».

Before and during the T'ang dynasty, the royal family of Kāšyar, like those of Khotan, of Kučā and of Qarā-šahr, had received or adopted, in conditions which are still unknown to us, a regular Chinese surname, that is to say one of those in use among the Chinese themselves. The surname of the royal family of Kāšyar was 裴 P'ei. In the case of Khotan, the surname seems to have been chosen in more or less close agreement with a native dynastic title (that of Vijaya, hence the Chinese surname Wei-ch'ih or Yü-ch'ih; see «Cotan»); we do not know whether anything similar occurred in the case of Kāšyar. It has often been said, and is still repeated in STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 62, that Kāšyar was conquered by the Arabs under Qutaiba in 715. But GIBB has tried to show (BSOS, II, 467 sq.) that the whole account of the campaign is legendary, a view endorsed by BARTHOLD («*Qāshghar*», in *EI*).

When Chinese domination had been finally eliminated from the western part of Chinese Turkestan and a Turkish dynasty installed with one of its capitals at Kāšyar, the city received the new Turkish name of Ordu-Känd, «City of the Royal Camp». This new name is mentioned by Al-Muqaddisī (cf. BROCKELMANN, 246), Al-Birūnī (cf. *Mi*, 280), Kāšyarī (BROCKELMANN, 246) and Abū-'l-Fidā (REINAUD, transl. II, II, 230); but it never superseded «Kāšyar» itself. HARTMAN, followed by BARTHOLD, maintains that from the Mongol period, the capital of the khans was not at Kāšyar, but at Yärkänd, and that Kāšyar's importance in modern times only dates from the