

man sources only give Ḥotan, and we must turn to Central Asiatic and Far Eastern works for fresh mentions of the Altaic form.

After Kāšyari, the next mention in date occurs in Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai's *Hsi-yu lu*, written in 1229. Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai had accompanied Chinghiz-khan in his campaign to the West (1219-1224). He never visited Khotan, but when speaking of Beš-baliq, the great centre to the north of the T'ien-shan, he devotes a few words to places of Chinese Turkestan situated more to the south; amongst them, he mentions « 五端 Wu-tuan (*Udon) which is the same as the kingdom of Yü-t'ien of the T'ang dynasty » (*Br*, I, 16). Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai was not a very strict phonetician, and the -o- of the second syllable implies in Altaic an o- also in the first. The form he had heard must have been Odon.

A few years later, the name of Khotan appears again in the *Secret History* (§ 263) in the form Wu-tan = Udan. But this form calls for comment. The *Secret History* was compiled in Mongolian in 1240, but the scholars who transcribed it with Chinese characters at the end of the 14th cent. had no tradition to fall back on as to the true pronunciation of many proper names. The name written in Uighur-Mongol writing which they rendered as Udan could also be read *Utan, *Odan, *Otan. The other Chinese transcriptions of the name during the Mongol dynasty leave no doubt that we should read Odon, not Udan (the form in the Mongol manuscript of Ulān-bātor lacks the final -n and is of no avail as it can be read Oda, Uda, Ota, or Uta). The Chinese transcription of the *Secret History* is nevertheless important in two respects. First, it shows that, in 1240, the official spelling in Uighur-Mongolian writing was still Odon, in agreement with the oldest Chinese borrowed form Yü-t'ien, *'Odan, and though the real pronunciation must have then been Odon as in Yü-tun, *'Odon. Secondly, if we had only Chinese transcriptions giving Odon and the very faulty Ulān-batōr manuscript, we would be in doubt whether the name was pronounced Odon or Ödön. But *Ödön would be based on a more ancient *Ödän, and even without an actual and ancient mention of the name in Uighur-Mongol writing, we know that the original name was Odon, not *Ödän, because if it had been *Ödän, the transcribers, guided by the Uighur-Mongol spelling of the initial syllable, would have transcribed it *Wu-tien, not Wu-tan.

Khotan is very often mentioned in *YS*, either as Yü-t'ien or more often as 斡端 Wo-tuan, Odon. The two forms betray the origin of the documents used by the compilers : those which give Yü-t'ien had originally been written in Chinese, while those which give Wo-tuan, Odon, had been translated into Chinese from the Mongolian. BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, II, 49), quoting passages from the *YS*, transcribes in five lines « Wu-duan », « Wa-duan » and « O-duan »; but the Chinese characters are the same, Wo-tuan, in all three cases. I know of no exception, save for the frequent corruption of 斡 *wo* to 幹 *kan* (for instance in *Yüan tien chang*, 9, 3 a; 34, 25 a). At the beginning of the Ming dynasty, however, the name of Khotan was given to a military colony on the western frontier of China, in the same manner as another was called Kūsän, i. e. Kučā, and this time the name is written 阿端 A-tuan, which would seem to represent *Adon (*Br*, II, 208-210). But we have there very probably a case in which 阿 *a* is used with its *o* reading, just as we find, in the Mongol period, the name of the Russians transcribed Wu-lu-ssü, Wo-lo-ssü and A[阿]-lo-ssü (or O-lo-ssü); it is however quite certain that the name always was Urus or Oros, not