

corresponding to § 134 of the *Secret History*, gives *čay-un törö* (or *otürü*), which is very close to the reading *ch'a-wu-t'u-lu* and still more to the *ch'a-kun-t'u-lu* of the Ch'ien-lung Commissioners.

The Chinese abridged version of the *Secret History*, the only one which PALLADIUS knew when he published his translation, gives (§ 134) 札兀忽里 *cha-wu-hu-li*, which would seem to render *ja'uquri*. PALLADIUS (*Trudy členov...*, IV, 66, 194) read it as «*jauhuri*», which is still retained by VLADIMIRCOV (*Čingis-khan*, 50). There can be no doubt, however, that this restitution is not correct. The complete text of the *Secret History*, in a phonetic transcription of the Mongolian original, gives once (§ 134) *cha-wu-t'i[揚]-hu-li*, and once (§ 179) *ch'a[察]-wu-t'i-hu-li* (the *t'i* being both times written smaller and a little to the right of the column), which would suppose **ja'utquri* and **ča'utquri*, respectively.

That the *-t-* is original is proved by Rašidu-'d-Dīn, where the title occurs twice, as in the *Secret History* (*Ber*, II, 104, 140). It has been misread «*Odjaout-kodi*», «*Djaout-kodi*», «*Tschavat-kodi*» (cf. ERDMANN, *Temudschin*, 585), «*Dschaukturi*» (WOLFF, *Gesch. der Mongolen*, 39), «*Dschaut-ikuri*» (ERDMANN, *ibid.*, 267), «*Jaut-ikuri*» (HOWORTH, I, 54). The correct form had, however, been given long ago by D'OHSSON (*Oh*, I, 47) and HAMMER (*Ha*³, 61), and is confirmed by BEREZIN's mss: it is جارت قوری *Jāūt-qūrī* (or *Čāūt-qūrī*), which is identical with the transcriptions of the complete *Secret History*.

An occlusive consonant at the end of a syllable, transcribed with a smaller character, is frequently omitted by less accurate copyists, as is the case in the *ch'a-wu-hu-li* of the abridged version of the *Secret History*. On the other hand, *-i* and *-u*, at the end of a word, are easily confused in Mongolian writing. There would thus be nothing surprising in finding *ch'a-wu-hu-lu* for **ča'utquri* in the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* if we did not have the puzzling *ch'a-wu-t'u-lu* of the Supplement to the *Kang-mu* and of the *Yüan-shih lei-pien*, going back to one or several lost mss. of the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu*, and the *čay-un törö* (or *otürü*) of the Ulān-Bātor ms. based on the original Mongol text of the *Secret History*. The form of the very faulty Ulān-Bātor ms. seems to be the result of an absurd interpretation «*rule of the moment*». That the *-törö* of this ms. should be the outcome of [*ča'u*]t-quri, the *-t* being mistaken for the first letter of the second element of the title, the *-q-* omitted and the final *-i* misread as *-u* (*-ü*, *-o*, *-ö*) would be possible in itself, and it may also be possible that the final *-i* was miswritten or misread *-u* in the Mongolian manuscript from which the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* was translated. Yet a difficulty remains, since we have also the *ch'a-wu-t'u-lu* derived from one or several lost mss. of the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* and because, as will be seen further on, a form **-quru* may be etymologically as correct as *quri*. *Ch'a-wu-t'u-lu* cannot be due to a misreading of a manuscript in Mongolian, since the known mss. have, correctly, *ch'a-wu-hu-lu* and since there is no trace of two independent translations of the work from the Mongolian. On the other hand, a mere coincidence which would make a corrupt reading of Mongolian origin in one work fall in with a corrupt reading of Chinese origin in another is hardly acceptable. I have no satisfactory solution to proffer. As to the hesitation between *ɣ-* and *č-*, which is reflected in the different transcriptions of the *Secret History* in §§ 134 and 179, it must be remembered that Mongolian manuscripts rarely distinguish the two letters, and that the translators and transcribers of the 14th cent. had no longer a living tradition to guide them as to the pronun-