

corresponding section of the *Wei shu*; but this original section of the *Wei shu* is lost, and it has been replaced in Sung times by the chapter of the *Pei shih*, with one change of date and the suppression of a few paragraphs. It is thus no surprise for us when we find in the *Wei shu*, as it exists now, exactly the same notice on Ch'ü-so as is given in the *Pei shih*; it adds nothing to the authority of the latter text. But a much earlier source, the *Wei lio*, which was written in the second quarter of the 3rd cent., mentions in succession « the kingdom of So-chü (Yärkänd), the kingdom of 碣石 Chieh-shih (*G'jät-zjäk; perhaps read 竭石 Chieh-shih, *G'jät-zjäk, and cf. CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 69), the kingdom of 渠沙 Ch'ü-sha (*G'j'wo-ša), the kingdom of 西夜 Hsi-yeh, ... » (cf. CHAVANNES, in *TP*, 1905, 554). The *Hou-Han shu* (118, 4a) has a notice on « the kingdom of Hsi-yeh, also called 漂沙 P'iao-sha » (*P'jäu-ša; CHAVANNES, misled by a misprint in the T'u-shu-chi-ch'êng Shanghai edition, gives 虜沙 Lu-sha in *TP*, 1907, 174; but all the ancient editions have P'iao-sha, adopted in DE GROOT *Chin. Urkunden*, II, 79). The *Hou-Han shu* owes much to the *Wei lio*, and I hold it for certain that its P'iao-sha is merely a copyist's error for the Ch'ü-sha of the *Wei lio*. It is no less clear that the Ch'ü-sha of the *Wei lio* and the Ch'ü-so of the *Pei shih* also represent one and the same name. In all likelihood, Ch'ü-sha, indirectly supported by P'iao-sha of the *Hou-Han shu*, is the correct form, and *sha* was altered to *so* in the *Pei shih* under the influence of the following So-chü. But even the identification of Ch'ü-sha > Ch'ü-so with So-chü = Yärkänd is unreliable, since both the *Wei lio* and the *Hou-Han shu* (this with the corrupt form P'iao-sha) agree in mentioning Ch'ü-sha quite apart from So-chü (Yärkänd). The wrong identifications of ancient names in this chapter of the *Pei shih* are numerous. Moreover, in spite of what was thought by STEIN and HERRMANN, the ancient name So-chü may have still been in use under the Wei of the 5th cent. This is at least what is implied by the notice of the *Pei shih* (97, 9b-10a; cf. *Wei shu*, 102, 7b; *T'ung tien*, 193, 7a; *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, 797, 16b) on the kingdom of the 阿 鈎 羌 A-kou Ch'iang. These A-kou (*Â-kəu), perhaps the same as the *Aškoka of the *Candragarbha* as translated in 566 (cf. *BEFEO*, v, 263, 275), came to the knowledge of the Chinese in the 5th cent., since the distance between their country and China is still given as from the Wei capital Tai, which was abandoned in 494. At the same time, the notice says that their kingdom lay « south-west of So-chü », thus still using So-chü as the ordinary name of Yärkänd.

The compilers of the *Hsi-yü t'u-chih* (18, 6a) have also identified with Yärkänd the « tribe (種 *chung*) 斫 句 迦 Chê-chü-chia (*T'šjak-kju-ka), also called 沮 渠 Chü-ch'ü (*Tsj'wo-g'j'wo) » of *Hsin T'ang shu*, 221 B, 3b. This is merely taken from Hsüan-tsang, who speaks of the kingdom of Chê-chü-chia, and adds in a note that « formerly » (舊 *chiu*) it was called Chü-ch'ü (cf. JULIEN, *Mémoires*, II, 221). Chü-ch'ü or 且 渠 Chü-ch'ü (*Tsj'wo-g'j'wo) is familiar to us as a Hsiung-nu title, which later became a surname, but no trace of a country or city of that name has been found in texts referring to Chinese Turkestan beyond the note in Hsüan-tsang's *Memoirs* (Chü-ch'ü is used instead of Chê-chü-chia in the biography of Hsüan-tsang inserted into the *Hsü-kaosêng chuan*, ch. 4, but it is there simply taken from the *Memoirs* themselves). Chê-chü-chia supposes an original *Čakuka. It occurs before Hsüan-tsang, in traditions going back to Jñānagupta who passed through Čakuka c. 557; the transcription is there 遮 拘 迦 Chê-chü-chia (*T'šja-kju-ka; cf. *TP*, 1905, 333-334, 353; *BEFEO*, v, 254-256). The geographical lists of the *Candragarbha*, translated in 566, mention the kingdom of 遮 居 迦 Chê-chü-chia (*T'šja-kj'wo-ka), shortened once