

sa-na-han and *ai-kên*; these forms represent the words transcribed *sa-li-an* and *o-i-o* in the late Jučen Vocabulary, equivalent to the Manchu *sargan* and *eigen* (cf. GRUBE, *Die Sprache und Schrift der Jučen*, pp. 97, 98). But it is no less evident that the pseudo-Yü-wên Mou-chao made use of the *I-i mou Hsia lu*, and moreover this can be established by a detail in the text. In both the *I-i mou Hsia lu* and the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* we read: 唐貞觀中靺鞨來中國始聞女真之名. This is a clumsy redaction. In LI Wên-t'ien's commentary, the text is punctuated after *chung-kuo*, so that the translation would be: «In [the period] *chêng-kuan* of the T'ang, the Mo-ho came to the Middle Kingdom, and [the Middle Kingdom then] heard for the first time of the name of the Nü-chên». But «*lai chung-kuo*» is hardly possible in Chinese, and I hold that, at an early date, before the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* was compiled, the word 朝 *ch'ao* had been accidentally omitted in the passage of the *I-i mou Hsia lu*. This is the reason why I have translated: «...the Mo-ho came [to render homage to the Court]; the Middle Kingdom [then] heard...». Such must also have been Ma Tuan-lin's opinion since he writes: «...the Mo-ho came [to render homage] to the Court.... It was at that [moment] that the Middle Kingdom...».

So all the elements of the accounts in the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* and the *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* can be traced back to the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien* or to the *I-i mou Hsia lu*, with the exception, however, of what relates to the form «Lü-chên» of the name of the Nü-chên. It is true that, as GIBERT says, there are many cases of alternations between *l-* and *n-* at the beginning of words (see «Lop» and «Lambri»), and many words beginning in Chinese with *l-* have an initial *n-* in the Sino-Corean pronunciation; such are the Sino-Corean 路 *no*, 綠 *nok*, 鹿 *nok*, 離 *ni*, etc. The alternation between Ch. T'u-yü-hun and Tib. Thu-lu-hun (cf. TP, 1921, 323) is mysterious; and so are the different values, *yin*, *lin* and *shên*, of one and the same Jučen character in GRUBE, *Die Sprache und Schrift der Jučen*, p. 51, No. 104 (I leave out *k'u*, which seems to be corrupt). The present case, however, is peculiar. In the Altaic languages, the most frequent occurrence is a change from *l-* to *n-* in languages which show a reluctance to an initial *l-*; for instance, the Persian *la'al*, «ruby», becomes *nal* in mediaeval Mongolian, and Mongolian uses both *lačîn* and *načîn* for the Turkish *lačîn*, «falcon». In spite of TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE, there is no apparent reason why the Ch'i-tan, who spoke a Mongolian dialect, should have changed to a form beginning in *l-* a name of Tungus origin which began either with *ȝ-* as Jürčên or with *n-* as the usual Chinese transcription Nü-chên. The very ascription of the form Lü-chên to the Ch'i-tan, which occurs only in Ma Tuan-lin, seems, moreover, to rest on some error. In the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* we are told, in a sentence relating to the Black River, that «the Ch'i-tan gave it the name (契丹目爲 *Ch'i-tan mu wei*) of Hun-t'ung-chiang», which is perfectly correct (cf. GIBERT, *Dictionnaire*, 327-328), and «Lü-chên» is merely given as another form of Nü-chên. In Ma Tuan-lin we read that the river «was given the name» (*mu wei*), without the «Ch'i-tan» which ought to precede *mu wei*. But in the next line, instead of the «some call them (或曰 *huo yüeh*) Lü-chên» of the *Ta-Chin kuo chih*, Ma Tuan-lin gives «the Ch'i-tan called them (契丹目之曰 *Ch'i-tan mu chih yüeh*) Lü-chên». It seems quite probable that the ascription to the Ch'i-tan of the name Lü-chên is due to a confusion with the sentence which correctly attributed to them the name Hun-t'ung-chiang of the Hei-shui.