

ciation of the title. The Persian gives no help, since Rašidu-'d-Dīn uses چ with both the values of č and j.

The meaning of *ja'ut-quri* or *ča'ut-quri* is not clear either. There can be no serious doubt that the equivalence intended in the note of the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* is 招討使 *chao-t'ao-shih* (corrupt in the *Yuän-shih lei-pien*, and in all the mss. of the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* except the one included in the ancient *Shuo fu* re-edited by the Commercial Press). It is the *chao-t'ao-shih* whom BİÇURIN had in view when he spoke of a « commander-in-chief against rebels ». Under the Chin dynasty, the *chao-t'ao-shih* were high officials of the first degree of the third rank; there were three, one for the north-east, one for the north-west, one for the south-west; their task was to « bring » (*chao*) and cherish those who submitted to the dynasty and to punish (*t'ao*) and seize those who rebelled against it (*Chin shih*, 57, 10 a). Yet, it seems certain that the note of the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* is a mistaken one, added by translators who no longer knew what *ja'ut-quri* meant, and were perhaps guided by the phonetic resemblance in the first syllable of both titles (if it were not for the *čay-un törö* of the *Ulän-Bātor* ms., one might even think that the corrupt *ch'a-wu-t'u-lu* was due to the influence of *t'ao* in *chao-t'ao-shih*). But in the *Secret History* (§ 134), the Chin general, after granting to Tämüjin, in the name of the Chin Emperor, the title of *ja'ut-quri*, adds that the Emperor may himself promote him later to the higher rank of *jao-ao* (= *chao-t'ao*[-*shih*]). So there can be no doubt that the *ja'ut-quri* was different from the *chao-t'ao-shih*, and ranked below him (for a mention in Rašid of a *chao-t'ao-shih* whose title was misread in *Ber*, III, 17, cf. my paper in *The Ts'ai Yüan P'ei Anniversary Volume*, 934).

Rašidu-'d-Dīn does not throw much light on the point. In BEREZIN's translation (*Ber*, II, 104), he explains *ja'ut-quri* as meaning « powerful prince » in « Chinese » (*bä zibān-i Hītāyī*), the Persian words actually used being (*Ber*, II, Pers. text, 169) امیر معظم *amīr-i mu'azzam* « great emir » (the امیر بزرگ *amīr-i buzurg* of *Temudschin*, 585, seems to be an arbitrary invention of ERDMANN). By « Chinese », we must here understand the Jučen language of the Chin ruling over North China. But Rašid wrote at a time when the real meaning of *ja'ut-quri* was forgotten, and, as a minister of a Chinghiz-khanid dynasty, he was prone to magnify the value of the title granted to its great ancestor.

Another solution has been proposed by modern Japanese and Chinese scholars. NAKA (*Chingisu-kan jitsuroku*, 132) says that *ja'ut* is the plural of *ja'un*, « hundred », and that *quri* is the Mongol root meaning « to assemble », « to gather together »; the whole term would thus mean « chief of a hundred families ». This explanation is clearly impossible for the second part, since a noun cannot be formed of a bare verbal root. T'U Chi (2, 13-14), while also explaining *ja'ut* as « hundred », adduced a passage of the *Chin shih* (55, 1 a), according to which 忽魯 *hu-lu* was the title of a chief placed at the head of several clans. His conclusion, identical with that of NAKA, was that *ja'ut-quri*, or *ch'a-wu-hu-lu* as in the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu*, meant « chief of a hundred men » (百夫長 *pai-fu chang*). This Chinese equivalent of *ch'a-wu-hu-lu* is also given, without comment, by WANG Kuo-wei (13 a).

It is true that the plural *ja'ut* of *ja'un*, now obsolete, occurs nearly twenty times in the *Secret History*, whenever it speaks of several hundred (this plural is also used as a tribal name; the