

This is also the only explanation I can think of for a document concerned with Kan-chou in Kan-su, probably dating from the 10th cent. It is written in Khotanese, but the name of Khotan is given there as Yütṭiṃṇi Kūhi, *i. e.* \*Yūtin-kūg, a transcription of the Chinese Yü-t'ien-kuo (\*Jü-d'ien-kʷək), « Kingdom of Khotan » (cf. BAILEY, in *BSOS*, ix, 541). The transcription betrays a Chinese pronunciation which is no longer that of the 7th cent. The final consonant of *kuo* (\*kʷək) is still heard, but the initial of *yü* (\*jü) is already the modern *y*-, and *d'ien* is rendered with a surd initial, as in the forementioned Tibetan transcriptions, which are perhaps of approximately the same date.

The ancient capital of Khotan, probably abandoned in the 11th cent., began some five miles north by west of the new Chinese town of Khotan; its remains under ground, discovered *c.* 1870, are within the area of the group of detached villages called « Yōtkan » (STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 191). CORDIER quotes (*Y*, III, 44-45) a passage of PARKER according to which « Yōtkan » probably « furnishes a clue to the ancient name of Yü-t'ien ». BARTHOLD (in *EI*, s. v, « Khotan ») is positive on the identity of the two names. THOMAS too says (*Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 8) that « Yōtkan » is « certainly the site, and perhaps retains a perversion of the name, of the ancient city of Khotan ». At the same time, and while speaking of « the Chinese name *U-then* », thus admitting that Ch. Yü-t'ien and Tib. 'U-then are one and the same name, Thomas adds that we connect that name with the word « Khotan » « naturally (but perhaps mistakenly) », and thinks of explaining « Uthen » with the name of a certain *stūpa* of « A-dha-ma », mentioned in a Tibetan chronicle of Khotan (*Asia Major*, II, 257, 270). I shall not try to reconcile three hypotheses which appear self-contradictory, since I think that they must all be abandoned. Neither the history nor the meaning of يوتقان Yōtqān (such is the true spelling; cf. GRECARD, *Mission dans la Haute-Asie*, III, 127; STEIN's transcriptions do not distinguish between *-q-* and *-k-*) is known to me (does *-ō-* mark the slurring of a following *-r?*). But there is no likelihood that the specifically Chinese *y*- initial of Yü-t'ien should have had an independent unetymological counterpart at Khotan itself. It is still more difficult to imagine, since Yü-t'ien and Khotan are fundamentally one and the same name, that that name should have developed on the spot such divergent duplicates as Yōtqān and Khotan. In spite of a partial phonetic analogy, my opinion is that the two names are not connected.

I have said that the Altaic name of Khotan in the Middle Ages was Odon, in agreement with the form supposed by Hsüan-tsang's Yü-tun, \*Odon. There are other examples of such double names. The ancient name of Kučā was \*Kuči, duly rendered in Chinese transcriptions and in Brahmī spelling. But at the same time, there was a Turkish name of Kučā, Kūsān, which we can follow from the 10th. cent. down to the 16th, in Turkish as well as in Mongol and Chinese sources, and which may be much more ancient than the date at which it is attested in the texts. When Kāšyarī compiled his Turkish dictionary in 1076, \*Kuči had already passed to Kučā (? Kūčä), but, alongside of Kučā, Kāšyarī gives the synonym Kūsān (BROCKELMANN, 245). The case of Khotan is quite parallel, and we find in Kāšyarī both « Ḥotan » (Khotan) and « Odon » (BROCKELMANN, 251, where the name is transcribed « Udun »; of course Arabic spelling does not permit of a distinction between *u* and *o*).

Except for the double form Ḥotan and Odon in Kāšyarī, all mentions of Khotan in Mussul-