

the subject, one from Rašid himself, the other from Bānākātī who copied Rašid. Rašid says : « The country of Hītai is known among the Mongols under the general name of جاوقوت Jāuqūt. Hītai is called in Chinese خانزی Hānzī. . . ». Bānākātī's text reads follows : « The region [of Hītai] which has almost always been the residence of the kings bears in Chinese the name of خانزُ جو خون قوی Hānzu-čū-hūn-qūi, in Mongolian that of جاوقوت Jāvqūt. . . ». In the first case, QUATREMÈRE corrected « Hānzī » to جانزی Jānzī, which he took to be the province of Shan-hsi. In the second QUATREMÈRE read جانزی و چون قوی « Jānzī ū Čūn-qūi », which he interpreted as « Shan-hsi and 中國 Chung-kuo (Middle Kingdom) ». D'OHSSON (*Oh*, I, 120) retained « Hānzī », without explaining it. « Hānzī », has passed as « Kansi » into *Hist. des Croisades*, Arm., II, 261. QUATREMÈRE was mistaken, and « Hānzī » is absolutely correct. Opposed by Rašid to « Mānzī », Man-tzū, Southern China (see « Mangi »), it renders 漢子 Han-tzū, « Chinese », and we have many texts showing that « Han » was used in the Mongol period as the official designation of the people of Chinese descent in Northern China, as distinguished from the Ch'i-tan, Jučen and Tangut people on the one hand, and from the « Man » or Southern Chinese on the other. I do not believe either in the correction « Jūn-qūi » = Chung-kuo; the word *kuo* is always transcribed by Rašid with *k-* (*g-*), not with *q-* (see « Caugigu », « Čipingu »). Bānākātī's text, however, is obviously corrupt. As there is no probability that it could give a name which does not occur in Rašid's text, I think that his جو خون قوی is merely a wrong duplication, by a copyist, of the following جاوقوت Jāvqūt. The latter name, said to be Mongolian, is puzzling. As already said by QUATREMÈRE, Rašid uses it more than once; it occurs for instance in *Bl*, II, 323, 374, 380, 383, generally applied to troops and in contradistinction to the Mongol forces. The natural deduction is that it was the general name in Mongolian for all the people of North China, excepting the Mongols. BLOCHET (*Bl*, II, 323) says that it is a plural of 兆戶 *chao-hu*, « million of families ». The hypothesis is hardly worth refutation; suffice it to say that it is wholly arbitrary, and that a Mongol plural of a transcription of *chao-hu* would have in principle, c. A. D. 1300, ended in *-s* and not in *-t*. D'OHSSON (*Oh*, I, 120) considers « Čauqut » as meaning « country of Chao », adding that the name had probably been borrowed from the Chinese; but he does not explain how *-qut* can mean « country ». My own view is as follows. Although BLOCHET always writes « Čauqut », Rašid's mss. do not distinguish between *č-* and *ǰ-*; both sounds, as a rule, are written *ǰ-*. In the *Secret History*, there are two forms which might be taken into account. One is Jāqut (or Jāyut) occurring twice (§ 281), with the translation « Chin », i. e. Jučen. But one does not see why it should be used as a designation of the Northern Chinese, and in a wider sense of all people of Northern China except the Mongols; above all, the first *-u-* of « Jāuqūt » is missing in Jāqut. The other form is twice transcribed 趙官 Chao-kuan (§ 251), and translated 宋 Sung (= the Sung dynasty). « Chao-kuan » renders in principle a Mongol form *Jaugon, and since the Sung Emperors belonged to the Chao family, there can be no doubt that it is their surname which constitutes the first part of the Mongol term. It is more difficult to be sure of the second. 官 *kuan* means « official », « mandarin », but 官家 *kuan-chia* was used in China for many centuries as a popular designation of the Emperor (cf. *TP*, 1921, 326, 328). So it is quite possible that « Chao-kuan » was really used in the sense of « Sung »,