

Chinese re-conquest in 1877. This view may be too radical, but the capital certainly was at Yärkänd at the time of Goes's visit in 1604.

Two of the earliest monuments of the Turkish language are connected with Kāšyar : the *Qutađyu bilig*, or «The Lore of the Royal Fortune» was written at Kāšyar in 1069, and the first great dictionary of the Turkish language, the *Dīvān lughat at-Turk*, completed in 1076, is the work of a man from Kāšyar, Kāšyarī.

The *Secret History*, compiled in 1240, gives the name of Kāšyar in the form «Kisqar» (§ 263); but is probably a misreading of the transcribers of the second half of the 14th cent. They did not recognize or did not know the name, and Mongolian writing does not distinguish between -s- and -š-; on the other hand, no distinction was then made in transcription between -γ- and -q-. As to the -i- of the first syllable, it might be considered as an easy misreading -i- for -a-, but in such a case we ought to assume the same misreading in one of the forms occurring in YS. It is not surprising, since in Mongolian *ki-* is «neutral» and can occur in words containing -γ- or -q-, whereas *ka-* is excluded. The form really given in the original text of 1240 must have been either Kišyar, or more probably Kāšyar.

The transcriptions in YS are many (cf. *Br*, II, 45-47), but resolve themselves to two original forms : 可失合兒 K'o-shih-ha-êrh (YS, 15, 5 a), 可失哈耳 K'o-shih-ha-êrh (YS, 63, 15 b and map of c. 1330), 可失哈兒 K'o-shih-ha-êrh (YS, 120, 7 a), 甲石哈 Chia-shih-ha (YS, 122, 1 a-b) and 可失哈里 K'o-shih-ha-li (YS, 180, 2 a; *Br*, I, 162) render Kāšyar; 合失合兒 Ha-shih-ha-êrh (YS, 8, 4 a) represents Qāšyar, altered according to the requirements of Mongol euphony. The abnormal 乞失哈里 Ch'i-shih-ha-li, apparently Kišyar, of YS, 123, 2 a, is probably due to a misreading of an original Kāšyar in Mongolian writing.

Polo says that Kāšyar was subject to the Great Khan, as he does in the case of Khotan, but states that Yärkänd was subject to a nephew of the Great Khan who must be Qaidu (see «Cotan», «Yarcan», «Caidu»). Surprise has been expressed at Polo's statement, for the reason that the boundary between Qaidu's territory and the Great Khan's lay between Qarā-šahr and Qomul, so that the whole of the western part of Chinese Turkestan must have belonged to Qaidu (Y, I, 183; *Br*, II, 47). This is not quite a true representation of the situation which obtained in Polo's days. It is true that Rašīdu-'d-Dīn speaks of Qarā-hōjo (to the east of Turfan) as keeping somehow neutral between Qubilai and Qaidu, and also that, on the map of c. 1330, Kāšyar and Khotan are listed among the possessions of Dürāi-Tämür, the then head of the house of Čayatai. But it is no less certain that, to the north of the T'ien-shan, Qubilai's forces held Almalīq in Ili, and that the Great Khan had established postal relays on the whole route from Tun-huang to Kāšyar *via* the Lop-Nör (see «Ciarcian», «Lop»); he could even send men to work for him in the mines of Badaḥšān (see «Badascian»). Under such conditions, the surprise should not be so great to be told that Kāšyar and Khotan belonged to the Great Khan as to hear of a different regime for Yarkänd. Prince Hoqu's rebellion, which for a time wrenched the region of Khotan from the rule of Qubilai, must have taken place shortly after the passage of the Polos (see «Cotan» and «Badascian»), and, moreover, would not affect the respective status of Yärkänd and Khotan. Perhaps Yärkänd, while included within the dominions under the direct administration of the Great Khan, had been given as an appanage, at least for