

texts, since a text translated by Sarat CHANDRA DAS (*JASB*, LV [1887], 202; cf. also WATTERS, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, II, 299) speaks of «the country called Gosthan, or place of virtue, now vulgarly called Khothan (or Khoten)...». «Gosthan» is impossible as such in Tibetan writing (unless written «Gos-than», which is unlikely), and I do not know how the translator came to his «place of virtue». It seems that «place» is not intended by Sarat CHANDRA DAS to render °*sthan* = Skr. *sthāna*, but rather *go*, which means «place» in Tibetan. With all due reserve as to the authority of the text (which is recent, and which shows traces of Russian influence) and of its translation, the fact remains that we have here, based on the Tibetan and long before the remarks of LÉVI and WATTERS, a form of the name of Khotan beginning with *go*- and not with *ku*-.

The current Khotanese form was evidently the one meant by Hsüan-tsang when he says that the name in the local language was Huan-na (*Xuân-nâ). This statement finds a striking confirmation in the late Khotanese texts, where the usual name for Khotan was Khotanese Hvatana-, Hvatāna-, later Hvaṃna-, Hvana-, Hvaṃ, locative sing. Hvaṃnya, Hvanya; adjective *hvatanaa-*, *hvaṃnaa-*, *hvaṃaa-*, «Khotanese» (cf. Sten KONOW, in *JRAS*, 1914, 342; *Saka Studies*, 145; BAILEY, in *BSOS*, IX, 522, 540). Sogdian used Xwōnyk, quoted by W. B. HENNING in his *Sogdica*, p. 10, from a list of peoples. Hsüan-tsang's transcription is a faithful rendering of Hvaṃna = *Hvanna, *Hvanna; it shows that the original intervocalic dental of the name was already assimilated to the following -*n* in the first half of the 7th cent. But the original form is preserved in more ancient Khotanese mss. as Hvatāna-, Hvatana- (cf. LEUMANN, *Das nordarische Sakische Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus*, 3rd Part, in *Abh. f. d. Kunde d. Morgenl.*, xx, No. 3 [1936], 528).

According to Hsüan-tsang, the Hu, *i. e.* the Iranians, said Ho-tan (*Xuât-tan); this transcription, which supposes an original *Hwātan, already heralds the ختن Ḥotan of later Mussulman tradition, the modern «Khotan».

By a «Hindu» form Ch'ü-tan (*K'juet-tân), Hsüan-tsang of course does not mean a Sanskrit form, but the one which was then in current use in the spoken language of Northern Hindus. Middle-Indian language having no *h-*, a *kh-* was the nearest possible equivalent, and this is how we must understand *K'juet-tân, which supposes *Khutan or *Khōtan. But, shortly after Hsüan-tsang, a different pseudo-Sanskrit form appears in the *Fan-yü tsa-ming*, to wit Kōrttana, with the insertion of an unetymological -*r-* (cf. BAGCHI, *Deux lexiques sanskrit-chinois*, 77, 295; HENNING, in *BSOS*, IX, 570).

A last form given by Hsüan-tsang remains to be examined, the Yü-tun (*Jü-d'uən) which the traveller says was the name of Khotan among the Hsiung-nu. Apart from the texts which repeat the gloss of the *Memoirs* on the names of Khotan, this transcription only occurs, so far as I am aware, in the *K'ai-yüan shih-chiao lu* (*Tōkyō Tripit.* of Meiji, 結, IV, 72 b) and in Hsüan-tsang's biography in the *Hsü kao-sêng chuan* (*ibid.* 致, II, 107 b); but both passages are also derived from the *Memoirs* themselves. Hsüan-tsang's information is however of the highest interest. The first point is to know what he meant by «Hsiung-nu». Of course there were no longer true Hsiung-nu in the 7th cent. At the end of the 3rd cent., Chu Fa-hu used Hsiung-nu where the corresponding Tibetan translation gives Hu-na = Hūṇa (cf. BEFEO,