

in these Kharoṣṭhī documents is everywhere else Khotamna or Khotana. Moreover, we are now in a position to prove definitely that LÉVI was right. Among the documents in Khotanese which I brought back from the Tunhuang caves, BAILEY found a sort of a bilingual « manual of conversation » in Sanskrit and Khotanese; the Sanskrit name of Khotan is given there as Gaustana and Gāmstana, both graphic renderings of Gostana. But Hsüan-tsang tells us that this was « the elegant name [used] locally », which I understand to mean that, though it was not the name of Khotan in Khotanese current speech, yet the Khotanese language used Gostana as a more literary name of the country. This is confirmed by the occurrence of *Gāmsta* (= **Gaustam*) and *Gaustamā* in a Khotanese document (cf. BAILEY, in *BSOS*, ix, 522, 541). BAILEY explains *Gaustamā* as « an inverse spelling of **gaustam*, after *-ana* and *-ama* had become *-am*. It may be so, but the solution depends to some extent upon the very history of the name Gostana.

At the same time as LÉVI, WATTERS (*On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, II, 299) was also struck by the constant value of *ch'ü* as *go-* or *gu-* in transcriptions. Starting from the other forms *Yü-t'ien*, *Ch'ü-tan*, etc., WATTERS supposed that they represented « a word like *Go-dan* or *Gothān* ». « The former », he added, « is found in *Türki*, and the latter in the Indian vernacular, and they represent the Sanskrit *Gosthāna*. These words denote a *place* or *station for cattle* ». According to WATTERS, it is this *Gosthāna* which, mispronounced and misunderstood as *Kustana*, led to « the silly legend invented to account for the name ». It is true that Skr. *gosthāna*, lit. « cow-station », means a « stable », or an « enclosure for cattle »; but the Turkī word intended by WATTERS, *gotan*, « enclosure for cattle (mainly for sheep) », identical with Mong. *gotan* > *hoto*, « enclosure for cattle » and « city », has of course nothing to do with *gosthāna*, nor with the name of Khotan. Something of WATTERS's hypothesis may however be retained, and was in fact retained by THOMAS (in *Asia Major*, II, 261; *Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 18). Skr. *sthāna*, « station », « country », occurs mainly in the geographical nomenclature of the North-West, and in some cases seems to be due to the much more frequent use of its Iranian equivalent *-stāna*. I have no doubt that for instance the well-known Skr. *Cīnasthāna*, « China », which is used in a Kharoṣṭhī document (RAPSON, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, 12, No. 35, where there is once *cina* and twice *cinasthanade*), is the Indian recasting of an Iranian **Čīnastāna*, the original of the Sogdian *Čīnstan* (see « Cin »). The correct form of the name restored by LÉVI as « *Jagudavardhana* » (*JA*, 1915, I, 84) is *Jāgudasthāna*, *Zabulistan*. Tibetan texts mention an *Āryastana* on the *Gośṛṅga* hill of Khotan (THOMAS, in *Asia Major*, II, 261; *Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 8, 18, 27, 108, 109). A *Gostana*, actually formed of *go* + *Iran. stāna* > *stana*, « country », could of course be interpreted as a Skr. compound of *go* + *stana* meaning « earth-teat », and this mistaken interpretation would be at the basis of the whole legend recorded by Hsüan-tsang and in Tibetan texts (I find no trace of the intermediary Prākṛit form « *Wothana* » mentioned by LÉVI, *JA*, 1915, I, 110); that *Gostana* in its turn may very well have become **Gostan* at an early date in Khotanese, and be used as such, in « elegant » speech, alongside with what we know to have been the current form of the name in Khotanese in Hsüan-tsang's time. As to the value of the first element *go-* of *Gostana*, I shall come to a discussion of it farther on. It may be that a form related to *Gostana* left traces in Tibetan