

*ulus*, «all the people» is well known. It occurs in literary texts, for instance in the historical colophon published by LIGETI (*TP*, 1930, 131, where it is transcribed *gür ulus*). In the preamble of Güyük's letter to Innocent IV, the Mongol Emperor calls himself «the Oceanic khan of the whole great nation» (*kür uluy ulus-nung talu-nung han*; cf. *Pe*, 22). RAMSTEDT's remark seems to be arbitrary. But whatever the case may be, and whether we read *gür-han* or *kür-han*, the fact remains that *gür* or *kür* is a good Mongolian word, and that the title *gür-han* or *kür-han* was in use among Mongol tribes. That it should have made its first appearance with the Qara-Ĥitai should therefore cause no surprise if we remember that the Ch'i-tan must have spoken a Mongol dialect.

Rubrouck refers to a sovereign «Coirchan» (var. «Concham»); but also «Coirchan» in Roger Bacon's extracts) to whom the «Turks» sent for succour at the time when the Franks took Antioch, as is said «in the history of Antioch»; he adds that «Coir» (or «Con») is a proper name, that «chan» (or «cham») means «soothsayer» and that the said sovereign was a «Caracatai», *i. e.* a Qara-Ĥitai (ROCKHILL, *Rubruck*, 108-109; *Wy*, 205-206). It has been taken for granted that «Coirchan» (or «Concham») was intended by Rubrouck to represent *gür-hān*, and this is probably the case. Yet there are errors and difficulties in the text. Rubrouck confuses *han*, «sovereign», «khan», with *qam*, «soothsayer». Moreover, at the time of the capture of Antioch by the Franks (1098), there was not yet any *gür-han*. It seems that Rubrouck wrongly associated a «Coirchan» whom he found mentioned in a history of Antioch with the *gür-han* he heard of in Central Asia. Unfortunately, it has been impossible so far to identify the *Hystoria Antiochie* alluded to by Rubrouck (cf. also ZARNCKE, *Der Priester Johannes*, II, 87-96).

It is said in the *Liao shih* (30, 3 a) that when Yeh-lü Ta-shih reached Samarkand, «the various kingdoms of the western countries raised 100,000 soldiers and called up 忽兒珊 Hu-êrh-shan to come and oppose him in the field (舉兵十萬號忽兒珊來拒戰)... Hu-êrh-shan was utterly defeated...». VISDELOU and BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 215) are in substantial agreement with the above translation. HOWORTH (*JRAS*, 1876, 272), relying on DE MAILLA's editor and on DOUGLAS, felt no hesitation in declaring it wrong, and so did MARQUART, on DE GROOT's authority (*Ueber das Volkstum der Komanen*, 142) : for them Hu-êrh-shan was not the name or the title of the commander-in-chief, but a designation of the soldiers. But while HOWORTH saw in Hu-êrh-shan the name «Ĥorāsān», MARQUART identified it with Ar. <sup>سج</sup> *yuzāt*, «soldier fighting for the faith». Despite HOWORTH, MARQUART and their authorities, those who have seen in Hu-êrh-shan the name, title, or epithet of the commander-in-chief have the support of the *Liao shih* itself, where it is said (ch. 116, 9 a) that Hu-êrh-shan was «the name (*ming*) of the commander-in-chief of the western countries». On the other hand, MARQUART's explanation is phonetically unacceptable : in the Mongol period, 珊 *shan* still sounded *san*, and represented *san* or exceptionally *sal* in transcriptions (cf. *TP*, 1930, 43); the original, with some uncertainty as to the sound -u- or -o- in the first syllable (cf. above for *ko-êrh-han*) can only be \*Ĥursan (or \*Ĥursal). BRETSCHNEIDER (*Br*, I, 215) suggested the Ĥwārizm-šāh, without finding elsewhere a confirmation of a battle fought between him and the Qara-Ĥitai; but he had also obviously thought of «the Seldjuk Sultan Sangiar of Khorasan» since he mentioned him, and was only