

Finally, and without absolutely discarding the possibility of the form Lü-chên, I must say that it seems to me to be a very doubtful form and perhaps due merely to a bad blunder of the *Ta-Chin kuo chih*. The character 慮 *lü* is not altogether unknown in Ch'i-tan transcriptions; a place-name 且慮 *Chü-lü* is mentioned in the *Liao shih* (116, 13 b); but it is of rare occurrence. Now there is a sentence which in the *Chin chih* (copying the *Ta-Chin kuo chih*) reads: «The Ch'i-tan were afraid (恐 *k'ung*) that the Nü-chên [might] make trouble» (契丹恐女真爲患 *Ch'i-tan k'ung Nü-chên wei huan*), but, in the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien* (3, 2 a), the original text is: «A-pao-chi was concerned (慮 *lü*) about [the fact that] the Nü-chên [might] make trouble» (慮女真爲患 *lü Nü-chên wei huan*), which becomes in Ma Tuan-lin «A-pao-chi was concerned about [the fact that] they (*i. e.* the Nü-chên) [might] make trouble» (慮其爲患 *lü ch'i wei huan*). It looks as though it were this 慮其 *lü ch'i* which was misread 慮真 *lü chên* by the author of the *Ta-Chin kuo chih*, perhaps in some text already corrupt, and thus gave birth to his alternative name «Lü-chên» for the Nü-chên. This was then taken over by Ma Tuan-lin, who, owing to an additional mistake, specified that this name «Lü-chên» had been given to the Nü-chên by the Ch'i-tan. If, however, «Lü-chên» should unexpectedly turn out to be a genuine form, a last hypothesis might be suggested: Lü-chên could be an apheretic form of a more complete *Nü-lü-chên < *Jurčen. Such aphereses are not unknown. I lay no stress on the names Ta-Chên = Ta [Nü]-chên and Tung-Chên = Tung [Nü]-chên which will be mentioned in the last part of the present note, because they are half Chinese. But ancient names of the Nü-ku mu-li of the Ch'i-tan period (the present Šira-mürän; cf. *infra*, p. 379), like 如洛+曩 *Ju-lo-kuai* (*Nziwo-lâk-kuâi), which occurs also as «Lo-kuai», would provide an exact parallel to *Nü-lü-chên > Lü-chên (on the ancient names of the Šira-mürän, cf. SHIRATORI, *Beiträge zur historischen Geographie der Mandschurei*, Tōkyō, 1914, I, 365). But, whatever the truth about «Lü-chên» may be, it must not be adduced to explain the «Longa» in Rubrouck's «Longa et Solanga», as has been suggested by ROCKHILL (*Rubruck*, 153; cf. *Wy*, I, 234).

The name Chu-li-chên, which occurs in the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien*, the *I-i mou Hsia lu*, and the *Ta-chin kuo chih* is of course nothing but a transcription of *Jurčen; it was a bad mistake of LI Wên-t'ien, in his Commentary on the *Secret History* (7, 2 a), to have stated that both Chu-li-chên and Nü-chên represented the name of the Mongol tribe Ĵirgin (occurring in the *Secret History*, §§ 170, 171, 185-187, 208). The opinion expressed in the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien* that the Chu-li-chên, *alias* Nü-chên, were the descendants of Chu-mêng of Kao-li is also an error. Chu-mêng was the name of the traditional founder of the kingdom of Kao-li or Kao-ku-li (Corea) just before the Christian era (cf. GIBERT, *Dictionnaire*, 429, 880). But the alleged connection between the names is fictitious, since it is based on the tacit assumption that the names are to be read *Chu Li-chên and *Chu Mêng, as though both began with the Chinese surname Chu; but both Chu-li-chên and Chu-mêng are mere transcriptions of foreign names. The correct equivalence of Chu-li-chên with *Jurčen was given long ago by BRETSCHNEIDER (in *JNCB*, x [1876], 108; cf. also TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE in *JRAS*, 1889, 437; *Br*, I, 224).

In the 登壇必究 *Têng-t'an pi-chiu*, published in 1598, DEVÉRIA found the name 主兒赤 *Chu-êrh-ch'ih*, rendered in Chinese 海西 *Hai-hsi*, «West of the Sea» (cf. *Revue de l'Extrême-*