

I have interpreted this as representing *Ĵürčät*, because the initial of the original name must have been *ĵ*-, not *č*- (the ms. does not distinguish between *č* and *ĵ*, nor does it mark the palatalization of *-u* after palatal consonants). But there was no *ĵ* in true Uighur words (although the Uighurs could pronounce it), and BANG and RACHMATI (*Die Legende von Oyuz Qayan*, in *SPAW*, 1932, 698<sup>261</sup>) may have been right when they retained *Čürčät*; an initial *č*- in Uighur finds some support in a Tibetan transcription which will be mentioned farther on. At a later date, the Sino-Uighur Vocabulary of the Board of Translators, 46*b*, seems to give *Čürčük* (cf. also TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE in *JRAS*, 1889, 438; F. W. K. MÜLLER, *Zwei Pfahlschriften*, 33; not «*Čürčür*» as was proposed as a second «possible» reading by *Bl*, II, 446), so that *Čürčük* has been entered in RADLOV's Dictionary (III, 2197, where it is so transcribed, but miswritten «*Čurcuq*» in Uighur writing). But there is certainly a mistake in the text, due primarily to the misplacement of a hook, and the Chinese phonetic transcription 主兒扯 *Chu-êrh-ch'ê* requires the name to be *Ĵürčät*.

YULE has said (*Y*, I, 231) that the Mongol form of the name was «*Churché*», i. e. *Čürčä*, although CORDIER, quoting PALLADIUS, elsewhere gives «*Churchin*», i. e. *Čürčün* (*Y*, I, 344). But this is not correct. The name occurs several times in the *Secret History* (§§ 247, 248, 253, 274), always as *Ĵürčät*, and the derived adjectival form, used as a proper name, is always *Ĵürčä-däi* (< \**Ĵürčä[n]* + *dai*; §§ 130, 171, 176, etc.; but the biography in *YS*, 120, 3-4, gives 朮赤 *Shu-ch'ih-t'ai*, \**Ĵu[r]čitai*). «*Sanang Setsen*» writes *Ĵürčit* (cf. SCHMIDT's Index, 496), which is also given in the *Altan tobči* (GOMBOEV, 22<sup>1</sup>, although the translation, p. 133, gives «*Ĵürčüt*»; I shall come back to this «*Ĵürčüt*» farther on).

A Tibetan text, translated in the middle ages from Chinese into Uighur, and from Uighur into Tibetan, speaks of the *bČur-či* dynasty (cf. P. CORDIER, *Catal. du fonds tibétain*, Index du *Tanjur*, p. 247), which would tend to show that, in the Mongol period, the name was pronounced in Uighur with an initial *č*-, not *ĵ*-. A more recent author 'Jigs-med nam-mkha speaks of the «*Man-Ĵu Ĵur-čhid*» and of the «*Ĵur-čhid* Dynasty *gSer*» (=Golden; cf. HUTH, *Gesch. des Buddhismus*, II, 20, 29); but, although writing in Tibetan, the author was a Mongol, and he merely writes in Tibetan letters the same Mongol form which we have met with in «*Sanang Setsen*» and in the *Altan tobči*.

The various transcriptions in Persian, Uighur, and Mongolian, with an alternation of *-ä-* and *-i-* in the second syllable, suggest an original form \**Ĵürčēn*, with a quiescent *-n*, on which a Mongol (not *Jučen*) regular plural in *-t* was formed, to wit \**Ĵürčēd* > \**Ĵürčid*. The palatalization of the first vowel (*-ü-*) may have been less marked in the Tungus original form than in Uighur and Mongolian. The Chinese transcriptions, however, raise new difficulties.

It is from the Chinese transcriptions that the form «*Jučen*», now in general use, has been adopted since GRUBE published his *Die Sprache und Schrift der Jučen* in 1896. This adoption is unfortunate. The initial *j* of «*Jučen*» has been sometimes wrongly supposed to have the German value of *j* = *y*, and consequently, perhaps also under the influence of the «*Yuché*» which was probably a slip or a misprint for «*Juché*» in *Y*, I, 231, we find «*Yučen*» twice in BANG and RACHMATI, *loc. cit.* 709, and also «*Iucen*» in BENEDETTO (*B*<sup>1</sup>, 441). But the main objection is that «*Jučen*», in spite of its scientific appearance, represents neither the Chinese transcriptions