

etymology based on Mong. *qarba-*, «to shoot»?), the information is too scanty to allow of any conclusion.

YULE says (*Y*, I, 101) that, according to Waśśāf, the Qaraunas are «a kind of goblins rather than human beings, the most daring of all the Mongols», and adds that Mirhōnd speaks in like terms. The quotation is taken from HAMMER (*Ha*<sup>1</sup>, I, 309, 344; *Ha*<sup>2</sup>, 223), who speaks of «devils» (Dämonen), although he translates the same words of Waśśāf which QUATREMÈRE (*Not. et Extr.* XIV, 282) has rendered by «who are like apes»; the word *nāsnās* means at the same time a kind of ape, and a human monster hopping on one leg. But we must not attach too much importance to Waśśāf's words. That «prince of rigmarole», as YULE calls him, would not miss the chance to make a pun, and what he really says is that the Qaraunās are similar to apes (*nāsnās*), not to men (*nā nās*). The only conclusion we can draw is that the Qaraunas must not have had a very attractive appearance.

Apart from their revolts and inroads, no information has come to us on the Qaraunas, except in a passage which QUATREMÈRE (*Not. et Extr.* XIV, 282) has quoted from the *Nuzhatu'l-Qulūb* of Qazwīnī, completed in 1340 (Bibl. Nat., Persian, Anc. fonds 139, p. 173). The passage occurs in the botanical section, still untranslated. According to QUATREMÈRE, Qazwīnī, «speaking of the tree called عرعر, 'boxwood', says آنرا سرو کوهی خوانند و قراونه اورس گویند 'It is called *sārv-i kohī* (lit. «mountain-cypress»), and the Qarauna name it *oros*.'» QUATREMÈRE admitted that he did not know what was the language of the Qaraunas, and that he could make nothing of «*oros*». In the zoological portion of his work, which was published in 1928 by J. STEPHENSON and to which I have devoted a long paper (*BSOS*, VI [1931], 555-580), Qazwīnī quotes Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Mongol words, but never any «Qarauna» word, and why should he if the Qaraunas spoke ordinary Mongolian? On the other hand, the word quoted is not known in any language under a form «*oros*». QUATREMÈRE has said عرعر '*ar'ar* meant «boxwood», but this seems to be a slip, as '*ar'ar* really means «juniper-tree», and such is also the sense of *sārv-i kohī* in Persian. Now the word for «juniper-tree» is well known in Altaic languages; in Eastern Mongolian it is *arča* (> *arca* [*c = ts*]); in Kalm., *arc<sup>a</sup>*; in Buriat, *arsa*; these forms are hardly reconcilable with the Arabic spelling of Qazwīnī (I do not know the form used by the Moghols of Afghanistan, if they still have the word). The Turkish forms are widely divergent, ranging from Uigh. *artuč* to Alt. Tel. *arčīn*; a form *artiš* exists in the Kazan and Čayatai dialects. Something must be wrong in QUATREMÈRE's quotation. At my request, H. MASSÉ was good enough to examine the ms., and, after consulting with Muḥammad Khan QAZWĪNĪ and Abbas IQBĀL, he came to the conclusion that Qarauna was a misreading for قراونه, an Arabic plural of Qazwīnī, meaning «the people of Qazwīn». As to the name of the tree in the Qazwīn dialect, it is not *oros* as QUATREMÈRE read it, but اورس *avirs*, which is known in Persian as one of the names of the juniper-tree. I have no doubt that MASSÉ is right; thus no text quotes any word special to the language of the Qaraunas.

We hear first of the «army» (*laškar*) of the Qaraunas; at a date which seems to be 1282-1283, they were organized into a *tümän* or myriarchy (see «toman»; cf. *Not. et Extr.* XIV, 282; *Ber.* I, 174), and YULE may be right (*Y*, I, 101) in supposing that the existence of this *tümän* is responsible for the average number of «ten thousand» men which Polo attributes to the gather-