

and that this country is not Yärkänd, but a place farther to the south, Qarȳalıq according to STEIN, CHAVANNES and THOMAS, Kök-yar according to HERRMANN (STEIN, *Ancient Khotan*, 28-29, 88-89; CHAVANNES, in *BEFEO*, III, 398, and *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 311, 342; THOMAS, *Tibetan Texts and Documents*, I, 25; HERRMANN, in *Southern Tibet*, VIII, 60, 450). That Čukupa, the ancient Tzū-ho, is to the south of Yärkänd is evident; it was on the direct road from Khotan to Taš-qurȳan. The case of *Čakuka, Hsüan-tsang's Chê-chü-chia, is not so plain. Hsüan-tsang passes it on his way from Kāšȳar to Khotan, which makes one think of Yärkänd quite naturally. Moreover there is a certain phonetic analogy between So-chü (*Säku), the name of Yärkänd under the Han, and *Čakuka, which might seem to be the same name with a Sanskrit derivative *-ka* suffix. It goes without saying that, in such a case, *Čakuka < *Säku could have nothing to do with *Čukupa < Čugapa < *Čigap. But the alternation of *-a-* and *-u-* occurs for both names, since we have met with a form Čukuka on the one hand and a form *Čakupa on the other. Both *Čakuka and *Čakupa occur in the lists of the *Candragarbha*, and what Jñānagupta connects with *Čakuka is located at *Čakuban in a later compilation. It looks as if both *Čukupa and *Čakuka had been used almost indifferently, or rather as if the first represented the name with a suffix in one language (perhaps the non-Iranian and non-Indian language responsible for most of the non-Indian elements in the Kharoṣṭhī documents), while the second would be an indianized form in *-ka*.

Such reasoning would be, however, of little avail if there were not geographical difficulties in the way of the identification of Hsüan-tsang's Chê-chü-chia with Yärkänd. The pilgrim, on leaving Ch'ieh-sha (Khaṣa, Kāšȳar) travels to the south-east, crosses the Śitā River, passes a great sand mountain (大沙嶺 *ta sha-ling*) and arrives at Chê-chü-chia. It seems difficult not to admit that the Śitā River here is the Yärkänd River, but this precludes the identification of Chê-chü-chia with Yärkänd, since a traveller coming from Kāšȳar would reach the Yärkänd River only after having left Yärkänd. That is why I concur with the above-named Western scholars in locating Chê-chü-chia south of Yärkänd and the Yärkänd River.

But I find it hard to decide between Qarȳalıq and Kök-yar. In my opinion, the general trend of the itineraries from Khotan to Taš-qurȳan is decidedly in favour of *Čukupa being Qarȳalıq. On the other hand, Kök-yar would be quite out of the way for any one going from Kāšȳar to Khotan; but, if *Čakuka (and *Čukupa) were Kök-yar, we might easily suppose that Hsüan-tsang followed a round-about route in order to visit the sites of *Čakuka which Jñānagupta had made famous in China. But there is nothing decisive here either way. In favour of Kök-yar, HERRMANN justly said that there was no room in the cultivated area between the Yärkänd River (south of Yärkänd) and Qarȳalıq for the « great sand mountain » spoken of by Hsüan-tsang. But I am not certain that it is easier to find it between Qarȳalıq and Kök-yar; Kök-yar is in a mountainous, not in a sandy district. Without lending too much weight to what may be a pure coincidence, I must remark that, among the few geographical names other than those of tribes and towns which are given by Kāšȳarī, there is Bayram-qumī, a sand hill or dune between Kāšȳar and Yärkänd (BROCKELMANN, *Kāšȳarī*, 29, 241). It must have been a site of some renown to be thus mentioned. I can only suppose that it lay in the fairly high sandy region, which extends east of Yangī-ḥisār and is marked on STEIN's map as having at least two Mussulman shrines, perhaps continuing earlier Buddhist ones. But to connect Kāšȳarī's Bayram-qumī with Hsüan-tsang's « great sand mountain », one