

in Mussulman countries was ختای *Hītāi* or خطای *Hītāi*. *Hītāi* maintained itself in Turkish (BROCKELMANN, *Kāšyari*, 251) and in Persian, and passed to the countries which heard of China through a Turkish channel like Russia («Kitai») and Greece («Κιταία»). As the first vowel was never written, خطای *Hītāi* > خطا *Hītā* (sometimes قتا *Qītā*) was often read «*Hātāi*», «*Hātā*», particularly by the Arabs (cf. the various forms given by FERRAND, in *JA*, 1919, II, 184), and this explains why the countries of Western Europe which first heard of China from Arabs in the Near East adopted «Cata», «Catai», «Cathay» (where *-th-* simply represents *-t-*). Plan Carpine's isolated «Kitai» bears evidence once again to his use of Russian interpreters. In an Uighur Manichaean manuscript published by VON LE COQ (*Türk. Manichaica aus Chotscho*, I, 29, 44, 45; BANG, *Manich. Hymnen*, in *Muséon*, XXXVIII, 47), a note has been added by a Manichaean «hearer» \*Yapyun or \*Fapḥua on his return from «*Htai*» (or «*Qtai*»), *i. e.* from northern China. If the name be \*Fapḥua, the first part would represent Ch. 法 *fa* (\**p<sub>1</sub><sup>w</sup>pp*), and the fact that the final labial was still heard would point to a date not later than the 10th cent.; this would be the earliest mention of the modern name in Central Asia. But \*Fapḥua is a doubtful reading. At any rate, it is interesting to find «*Htai*» (or «*Qtai*»; the writing does not distinguish between *h* and *q*) written in Uighur without the first vowel as is done in the Arabic transcriptions.

The final element is more embarrassing: *otan* according to the Chinese, *otaŷ* in the Orkhon inscriptions, *otai* in Uighur and Persian forms. Here certain observations are necessary. We generally transcribe such Turkish finals as *-ai*, but the last element is actually a semi-vowel, and the proper transcription would be *-ay*. As to the Orkhon inscriptions, the «runic» letter which THOMSEN finally transcribed as *-ŷ* is of a somewhat doubtful value, but certainly contained a nasal element. It occurs in *Toŷuquq*, the first syllable of which is transcribed *tun* in Chinese; in *qoŷ*, «sheep», later *qoi*, but in Mong. *qoni*, etc. The presence of a nasal element in the name of the Ch'i-tan is indirectly confirmed by the Mongol form, «Kitad» > Kitat. This is a plural, but it can only be accounted for by starting from a singular \*Kitan (< \*Qītan; cf. VLADIMIROV, in *Doklady Ak. N.* 1929, 172; RAMSTEDT, *Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 233), identical with the Chinese transcription and very close to what *Qītaŷ* must have really sounded. An Uighur pronunciation \*Qītan is required by the forms «Ge-tan» and «Ge-taŋ» of the Tibetan translation mentioned above. The alternative \*Qītan/\*Qītai is more or less similar to that of «*altan*» and «*Altai*» (see «*Altai*»). This phonetic link also connects the Ch'i-tan with the Mongols. I do not feel inclined to accept MOSTAERT's view (*Bull. Cath. Univ. of Peking*, No. 9 [1934], 40) that \*Qītan is an ancient plural of *Qītai*.

According to BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 265), «the first emperor of the Liao dynasty received an embassy from the Ta-shih in 924, when he was sojourning near the ancient capital of the Hui-hu»; in principle the Ta-shih are of course the Arabs; the ancient capital of the Hui-hu or Uighur is Qara-balyasun in the Orkhon basin (cf. HOWORTH, in *JRAS*, 1881, 175, who also speaks of the embassy as coming to the camp in Mongolia, but believes that the Ta-shih here referred to were not the Arabs, but Persians). BARTHOLD (*12 Vorlesungen*, 120) also speaks of this meeting of Mussulmans and the Ch'i-tan in Mongolia, on the sole authority of BRETSCHNEIDER. Here again, I am afraid that the text has been misunderstood. In the *pên-chi*, under the year 924, we hear of the various stages of T'ai-tsu's advance into Mongolia, but life went on in the meantime as