

The Chinese account of Yeh-lü Ta-shih also says that he took the title of 葛兒罕 *Ko-êrh-han*, written 闊兒罕 *K'uo-êrh-han* in one of the biographies of *YS*, 120, 7 *a*; according to the vocabulary of the *Liao shih*, 116, 9 *b*, *ko-êrh-han* is the title of the sovereigns «north of the Desert», *i. e.* in Mongolia. The two Chinese transcriptions represent respectively **gôrhan* and **kôrhan*, but seem to have been made by people who found the title in Uighuro-Mongol writing, and had no tradition as to its correct pronunciation; the original should be read *gürhan* or *kürhan*. Speaking of the Qara-Hıtai, Juwainı (II, 86¹⁷) gives it as كورخان *gür-hān*, and adds that it meant *hān-i hānān*, «khān of khān» («king of kings»); cf. the «*chanchana*» of a Latin translation made in 1221 from the Arabic in ZARNCKE, *Der Priester Johannes*, 31-32.

It would not be necessary to denounce the confusion made by HAMMER and already dispelled by ERDMANN (*Temudschin*, 577-581) between *gür-khan* and Mong. *kürägän* or *kürgän*, «son-in-law», and especially «son-in-law of the Emperor» (Ch. *fu-ma*), if it had not been repeated by HOWORTH (*JRAS*, 1876, 274) and in BRETSCHNEIDER's index (*Br*, II, 338). The two words can have nothing in common.

BARTHOLD, who by some oversight states that the title *gür-hān* is only known in connection with the Qara-Hıtai, suggests that the first part may represent the old Turkish word *kür* or *kül*, known from the Orkhon inscriptions, and also from Gardēzi and Kāšyari. It is true that there is a Turkish word *kül*, occurring for instance in a name like *Kül-tegin* or a title like *kül-čor*; on the other hand, the name is given as *Kür-tegin* by Gardēzi (BARTHOLD, *Otčēt o poézdké*, 90, 114-115), and the title as *kür-söl* by Ṭabari (cf. MARQUART, *Histor. Glossen*, 181-182; CHAVANNES, *Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 285; *Mi*, 301). Kāšyari only knows a word *kür*, «brave» (BROCKELMANN, 117), but says that the Uighur sovereign bears the title of «Köl-Bilgä khan», «the khan as wise as a lake» (BROCKELMANN, 245). It may be that *kül* was the northern and eastern form of the word which became *kür* in the west, but it is also possible that an independent word *kül*, unknown in the west, was contaminated by the better known *kür* in Gardēzi's source, and was misunderstood as *köl* in the Uighur title by Kāšyari; I do not doubt that the title of the Uighur sovereign was *Kül-Bilgä khan*, and that it had nothing to do with *köl*, «lake».

But there is no reason, in my opinion, to seek for a Turkish explanation of *gür-hān*. While it is true that the title is unattested before the Qara-Hıtai, it is well known as the title of the Kerait sovereigns, and we also find it adopted in the first period of the history of Chinghiz-khan by his Mongol rival Jamuqa (cf. *Secret History*, §§ 141, 150, 177, 198; also § 203; *Oh*, I, 63; *Ber*, II, 124). In the case of Jamuqa, Rašidu-'d-Din adds that *gür-hān* means «Emperor of sultans and kings». In the *Secret History*, the *gür* of *gür-hān* is interpreted as 普 *p'u*, «general», «universal». I have no doubt that D'OHSSON gave long ago the true explanation (*Oh*, I, 99) when he said that *gür*, in Mongolian, meant «whole», and that the true meaning of *gür-hān* was «universal khan». Uighuro-Mongol and Arabic writings do not distinguish between *g-* and *k-*, and the Chinese transcriptions of the *Secret History* often give *g-* for words which are actually pronounced with a *k-* in Mongolian (for instance *gür-*, «to reach», instead of *kür-*; *güčün*, «strength», instead of *küčün*, etc.). Now, there is in Mongolian a word *kür*, generally rendered as «crowd». RAMSTEDT (*Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 246) says that the word is onomatopoeic for a «great noise» and that the meaning crowd is secondary. But the term *kür*