

seven centuries later. The case of 于 *yü* (\**jü*) is more difficult. In KARLGREN's transcription *j-* is a *yod*, with an approximate value of *y-*. There is some reason to believe that in archaic Chinese the word began with *g-*, \**giu*, but we cannot say that this is certain, nor that an initial *g-* still existed in the pronunciation of Han times. On the other hand, 于 *yü* is not regularly used in Buddhist transcriptions, but frequently occurs under the Han in the transcription of Hsiung-nu names or titles, for instance in the title of the 單于 *shan-yü* or Hsiung-nu sovereign. Unfortunately none of these early transcriptions has so far been restored to a certain original. But we must keep in mind the use of *yü* in the transcription of terms of Hsiung-nu origin; it will be of some moment in the discussion of the various forms mentioned for the name of Khotan.

The principal text to adduce for such a discussion is a note in Hsüan-tsang's *Memoirs* which has passed, though in a more or less curtailed form, into various works, including the *Hsin T'ang shu* (cf. *JA*, 1895, II, 362-363; CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 125; WATTERS, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, II, 299; LÉVI, in *BEFEO*, IV, 560; v, 260; STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 153; *Ta T'ang hsi-yü chi*, ed. of Kyōto University, XII, 24, and *Apparatus criticus*, 125-126). Here is the complete text :

«...One arrives at the kingdom of 瞿薩旦那 Ch'ü-sa-tan-na (\**G'ju-sât-tân-nâ*). [Note :] In the language of the T'ang (= in Chinese), [this] means 'Earth-teat' (地乳 *Ti-ju*); it is the elegant name [used] locally (卽其俗之雅言). The local language (俗語 *su-yü*) says 'Kingdom of 渾那 Huan-na (\**Xuân-nâ*)'. The 匈奴 Hsiung-nu call it 于遁 *Yu-tun* (\**Jü-d'uən*); the Hu (Iranians), 豁旦 Ho-tan (\**Xuât-tân*); the Hindus (Yin-tu), 屈丹 Ch'ü-tan (\**K'juət-tân*). Formerly [the Chinese] said *Yü-t'ien*; it is an incorrect [form].»

This note is of much greater value than has been assumed hitherto, and can be verified in most particulars.

Ch'ü-sa-tan-na, said to mean « Earth-teat », was restored by JULIEN as *Kustana*; and this is still the only form mentioned by STEIN (*Ancient Khotan*, 153-154), by HERRMANN (*Southern Tibet*, VIII, 440), and by THOMAS (*Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 18). A seeming confirmation was provided by the form *kustañāgasa* of a Kharoṣṭhī document (STEIN, *loc. cit.*; RAPSON, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, 339<sup>3</sup>); STEIN did not revert to the question in *Serindia* or in *Innermost Asia*. It is to be regretted that no greater attention was paid to the remarks published by LÉVI in 1905 (*BEFEO*, v, 258-260). LÉVI showed that 瞿 *ch'ü* was always used by Hsüan-tsang to render *go-* or *gu-*, not *ko-* or *ku-*, and that *Gostana* meant « Earth-teat » just as well as and even better than *Kustana*. Moreover, Indian lexicographers mention *gostanī* as a name of the grape, and LÉVI explained *gostanī* as « Khotanese », the name being that of the grape of Khotan spoken of by the Chinese and by Polo. LÉVI's restoration « *Gostana* » ought to have been accepted at once; it is the only one which is in agreement with the Chinese transcription (KARLGREN's *Dictionary* is here misleading; while giving the two pronunciations *chü* and *ch'ü* of 瞿 in modern Chinese, it restores only \**kju* as the ancient sound; but *ch'ü* is \**g'ju*, and it is only with this second pronunciation that the character occurs in transcriptions). As to *kustañāgasa*, it is an isolated example, with a first consonant of ambiguous value, and it occurs in a text where it may mean something other than Khotanese (cf. *BSOS*, IX, 541), particularly if we remember that the name of Khotan