

way that by the use of the character 州 *chou*, the name should acquire a purely Chinese appearance. The result is that Ch'ên Ch'êng, in the *Hsi-yü fan-kuo chih* which embodies the information collected during his embassy of 1414 (ed. of the Pei-ping National Library, 19 a), speaks of Huo-chou as meaning «Fiery district», and as owing that name to its hot climate. But some transcriptions are chosen without any attempt at a semantic value: for instance, 和綽 *Ho-ch'o*, used by Ou-yang Hsüan in the 14th cent., does not pretend to be anything but a phonetic rendering of Qoço. A Jučen form 高察安 *Kao-ch'a-an* = *Kao-čän*, based on the Chinese name *Kao-ch'ang*, existed during the Ming period (cf. GRUBE, *Die sprache und Schrift der Jučen*, p. 17).

Even when many texts still use the simple form *Ho-chou*, the enlarged *Qarā-qōjo* makes its appearance as 合刺禾州 *Ha-la-[ho-]chou* in 1285 (YS, 13, 9 a; perhaps a misreading for the next form), afterwards 合刺和州 *Ha-la-ho-chou* in 1286 (YS, 14, 4 b), 哈刺霍州 *Ha-la-ho-chou* in the biography of A-shu (see «Agiul»; YS, 128, 3 a) and 哈刺火州 *Ha-la-huo-chou* in 1330, 1347 and in the biography of Ye-lü Hsi-liang (YS, 34, 3 b; 34, 9 a; 41, 5 b; 180, 2 a). The form 合刺火者 *Ha-la-huo-chê* occurs on the Chinese map of c. 1330, of Western origin, and in the corresponding list of YS, 63, 15 b; it may be the one which is at the basis of a misreading *Ha-la-huo* in the text quoted by LAUFER, *Sino-Iranica*, 236. The same form *Ha [哈]-la-huo-chê* occurs in a Ming itinerary (*China Review*, v, 232). The modern Chinese transcription is 哈喇和卓 *Ha-la-ho-cho* (cf. *Hsi-yü t'u-chih*, 14, 6). It is said in the *Ming shih* (329, 8 a) that *Huo-chou* is also called 哈刺 *Ha-la*, the same name of course as *Qarā-hōjo* (cf. *Br*, 186; *JA*, 1925, I, 582). Naturally enough, BRETSCHNEIDER said that there were «evidently two characters wanting in the Chinese text». But the form of the *Ming shih* is curiously supported by a text hitherto mistranslated. «Sanang Setsen» speaks, under the year 1439, of a land (*yaġar*) which SCHMIDT's translation calls «Turufanu Chara» (=Turufanu *Ĥara*), adding that Turfan must be meant (*Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 155, 406; SCHMIDT's Mongol text actually gives *Tü*^o). From this passage BLOCHET (*Moufazzal*, 691) deduced the existence of a «Turfan the Black», grammatically impossible. But the text is perfectly clear, and is correctly understood by the Chinese translator of the Mongol chronicle: *Turufan-u Qara nārätü yaġar* means «the land of Turfan called Qara». In other words, the Mongol chronicler of 1662 knew *Qarā-hōjo* under the same shortened name *Qara* which is given in the *Ming shih* as an alternative name of *Huo-chou*. The same form *Qara* occurs, also in connection with the events of 1439, in the *Altan tobči*, half a century earlier than «Sanang Setsen» (GOMBOEV ed., 161); but, instead of *Turufan-u*, the *Altan Tobči* gives *Mingan-u*, probably by a scribe's error.

Polo's «Carachoço» is quite correct, and in agreement with the various spellings of *Ha-la-huo-chou* in YS and with Rašidu-'d-Dīn's قراخوجو *Qarā-hōjō*, although Juwainī, and sometimes Rašid also, write قراخواجه *Qarā-hōjah* (*Bl*, II, 85, 502, 595, 609), in the same way as Chinese sources sometimes give *Ha-la-huo-chê*. The latter Turkish form, now prevalent in Chinese Turkestan, is the result of popular etymology, *Qarā-hōjah* meaning «Black master». An identification of the *Kc'n* (= **Kačän*) of an old Sogdian document with *Kao-ch'ang* is not probable (cf. *TP*, 1931, 460).

The name *Kao-ch'ang* goes back to Han times. As *Kao-ch'ang-pi* [壁], or «Wall of *Kao-ch'ang*», it was the designation of a Chinese military colony which first existed for a short time