

has to assume that an interversion has occurred in the pilgrim's account, and that he passed the « great sand mountain » before reaching the Šitā or Yārkānd River.

This is merely a hypothesis, but one which finds a certain support in itineraries of the T'ang period. Of course Kōk-yar is not, like Yārkānd and Qarʿaliq, on the main road from Kāšyar to Khotan so that, if Chê-ch'u-chia or Chu-chü-po were Kōk-yar, we should not expect to find it mentioned among the stages of the route from Khotan to Kāšyar; but if one of the names be Yārkānd and the other Qarʿaliq, or if both be Qarʿaliq, the absence of both is more surprising. Such is the case, however, in Chia Tan's itinerary from Khotan to Kāšyar, dating from the end of the 8th cent., which is given in *Hsin T'ang shu*, 43 B, 15 b-16 a, and has been translated by CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 123. Not one of the names has been identified, but on some of them certain comments are possible. In 635 and 648 respectively, « general governments » (*tu-tu-fu*) had been established at Kāšyar and at Khotan; they had under their jurisdiction 15 districts (州 *chou*) for Kāšyar, and 5, sub-divided into 10 in 675, for Khotan. The list of those districts has not been preserved, but some of their names are given in Chia Tan's itineraries; others, sometimes the same, are included in a curious list of « Hu districts » (Iranian and « Tocharian » districts) which are said to belong to Ho-hsi (Tangut, Kan-su), but which are in fact all situated in the western part of Chinese Turkestan (*Hsin T'ang shu*, 43 B, 8 a). In Chia Tan's itinerary, the first stage, 80 *li* south of Kāšyar, is 演度州 Yen-tu-chou; this is evidently the same as the 寅度州 Yin-tu-chou of the list of « Hu districts ». Although the name Yen-tu or Yin-tu has not been identified, one is tempted to locate that « district » at Yangī-ḥisār. Going 160 *li* farther to the south-east, one reaches 雙渠 Shuang-ch'ü, « Twin Canals », which was the ancient lodging-house (*kuan*) 鞬飯 Chieh-fan (*Kjät-b'j'wən). Going again 320 *li* to the south-east, one arrives at the town (*ch'êng*) of 郅支滿 Chih-chih-man (*T'šjēt-t'šjē-muân), which is also called 磧南州 Chi-nan-chou. I have no doubt that this is the 郅及滿州 Ying-chi-man-chou, or « district of Ying-chi-man (*Iäng-g'jəp-muân) » of the list of « Hu districts ». The « River of the lodging-house (*kuan*) 繫 I (*·lei) » is crossed south-east of Chih-chih-man, and then one goes east; from Chih-chih-man to Khotan the distance is 670 *li*. CHAVANNES supposed that Chih-chih-man, judging from the distances, was the place corresponding to Hsüan-tsang's Chê-chü-chia.

I think that two of the above names are mentioned in the itinerary preserved by the *Hudūd al-'Ālam* and by Gardēzī (*Mi*, 260). The second stage from Kāšyar to Khotan is called كرمان Karyān by the first text, كرمان Karmān by the second. Whether we correct both to كرمان *Karbān, or the first one to the Karmān given by the second, we have in either case a very satisfactory transcription of Chia Tan's « lodging-house » of Chieh-fan (*Kjät-b'j'wən). The next name is written وجخان (= وجخان Uč.ḥbān) in the *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, ځچمان H.č.mān by Gardēzī. Although Chih-chih-man (of which the « Hu district » Ying-chi-man must be a clerical corruption) does not come immediately after Chieh-fan in Chia Tan's list, it is very tempting to read ځچمان Čičimān, which would be in exact agreement with the Chinese transcription.

But even if these equations be correct, identifications on the map are very hypothetical. If the « River of the lodging-house I » were the Yārkānd River, Chih-chih-man might be Yārkānd itself. The other name Chi-nan-chou would almost favour the identification, since it means « District South of the Desert ». The « desert » would be the sand dune Bayram-qumī mentioned as being between