

Mong. Hotong in its sense of «Western Chinese Turkestan and its settled Mussulman population».

On a legendary primitive name «Chia-lo-sha-mo» of Khotan, see «Cascar».

Khotan played an important part in the transmission of the Buddhist scriptures to China. At the end of the 2nd cent., the fictitious opponent in the polemical Buddhist treatise *Mou-tzū* is alleged to have visited Khotan and seen the Buddhists there (cf. *TP*, 1920, 322, 419). The first Chinese Buddhist whom we know for certain to have travelled abroad, 朱士行 *Chu Shih-hsing*, left for Khotan in 259 and died there at the beginning of the 4th cent. (cf. *BEFEO*, x, 225).

According to the *Hsin T'ang shu*, the family name of the king of Khotan was 尉遲, which nowadays is generally pronounced *Wei-ch'ih* (cf. *CHAVANNES, Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 126, 375). *STEIN (Ancient Khotan, 173)* proposed to see in *Wei-ch'ih* a transcription of *Vijaya*, which is the first element in a long line of the names of kings of Khotan, and there is no doubt that he was fundamentally right. But we can now reach a greater precision, both from the Khotanese and from the Chinese side.

The character 尉 has two readings, *wei* (**ʔi*) and *yü* (**juət*), and the dictionaries and glosses, as well as the special works devoted to Chinese surnames, leave no doubt that with the second reading it was one of the components of the double surname *Wei-ch'ih*, which, regularly, ought to be read *Yü-ch'ih* (**juət-d'i*). As a matter of fact, the popular deified 尉遲恭 *Wei-ch'ih Kung*, *tzū* 敬德 *Ching-tö* (*GILES, Biogr. Dict.* No. 2267 [585-658]) is always known in Peking as *Yü-ch'ih Ching-tel*. This *yü* reading explains why the name of the 尉頭 *Wei-t'ou* or *Yü-t'ou* of Han times, which lay between *Kāšyar* and *Uč-Turfan* (cf. *TP*, 1907, 207), should have been revived as a *chou* of 鬱頭 *Yü-t'ou*, and moreover misapplied, in the administrative organization of the Chinese Turkestan created by the T'ang in the 7th cent. (cf. *Hsin T'ang shu*, 43 B, 14 b; the same name is written 蔚頭 *Wei-t'ou*, or *Yü-t'ou*, *ibid.* 8 a). In the biography of a monk who lived in China in the first quarter of the 8th cent. and who belonged to the family of the kings of Khotan, the name is written in the usual way by the *Sung kao sêng chuan*, but 鬱持 *Yü-ch'ih* (**juət-d'i*) in two earlier sources (cf. *BAGCHI, Le canon bouddhique*, 552; the form given in *NANJIŌ, Catalogue*, App. II, No. 152, is a combination of the two forms, which I do not find in his sources). In a manuscript brought back from *Tun-huang* by *STEIN* (No. 910 of the provisional inventory), I have also noted a name 鬱遲佛德 *Yü-ch'ih Fo-tê*, which is perhaps the same as the *Yü-ch'ih Hsien*[*||*]-*tê* found by *WANG Kuo-wei* in another *Tun-huang* document (*Kuan-t'ang pieh-chi, pu-i*, 24 a; either *Wang* or I may have wrongly copied the third character). I shall accordingly write *Yü-ch'ih*, not *Wei-ch'ih*.

CHAVANNES, finding in an inscription of A. D. 495 at *Lung-mên* the mention of a woman whose surname was *Yü-ch'ih*, thought that she belonged to the family of the kings of Khotan (*Mission archéologique*, 474). But this is a mistake. The surname *Yü-ch'ih* never occurs in connection with Khotan before the beginning of the T'ang dynasty; originally it was the transcription of a foreign clan name or title of the T'o-pa *Wei* (cf. *Wei shu*, 113, 22 b; *CHANG Chu, Hsing shih hsün yüan*, 41, 2 b-3 a; above all *SU Yü's Wei shu kuan-shih chih k'ao-chêng* [on which see «*Calacian*»], ff. 62-63 of my ms. copy). It is certainly to that T'o-pa clan that the lady of the inscription of *Lung-mên* belonged.

The king of Khotan whose surname we are told for the first time was *Yü-ch'ih* sent out