

Orient, I, 175). Here again TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE (*JRAS*, 1889, 438) absurdly transcribes «Tchu-erh-tch'ek», as if a pronunciation *êrh* could be contemporaneous with a pronunciation in which the ancient *-k* of *ch'ih* (*t's'ïäk*) was still preserved. As to Hai-hsi, TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE, unable to explain it, thinks that it probably «is a simple pun». I see things differently. I have no access to the original edition of the *Têng-t'an pi-chiu*, nor do I suppose had DEVÉRIA either. In my nineteenth-century reprint (ch. 22), *Chu-êrh-ch'ih* occurs twice; once (No. 77) it is given as the equivalent of Hai-hsi, but the second time (No. 183) the Chinese equivalent has been suppressed. The Manchus, holding themselves to be the descendants of the Chin, expurgated most of the works in which the name of the Nü-chên or Nü-chih occurred, and I have little doubt that the original edition of the *Têng-t'an pi-chiu* had in one place Nü-chih, which has been left blank in modern editions, and in the other place Hai-hsi, which was a regular geographical name in the region in northern Manchuria occupied by the Nü-chên of Ming times (cf. SHIRATORI, *Beiträge*, II, 527). As to *Chu-êrh-ch'ih* itself, the term, contrary to what DEVÉRIA and TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE thought, has no real bearing on the forms used in China and by the Chinese; the section in which it appears is a Sino-Mongolian Vocabulary and *Chu-êrh-ch'ih* merely represents the Mongolian form, which we know to have been *Jürçit* in late Ming and early Ch'ing times. In the transcriptions of the *Têng-t'an pi-chiu*, the final *-t* is omitted in *künji[t] = künjit*, «sesamum» (No. 445); the case is almost certainly the same with *Chu-êrh-ch'ih*, which is accordingly to be restored as the regular Mongol form *Jürçit*.

The true name of the Nü-chên appears in native writing in the Vocabulary of the Board of Translators of c. 1500 published by GRUBE (No. 324); it is written with two Jučen characters which are phonetically transcribed 朱先 *Chu-hsien*, with the Chinese equivalent Nü-chih. But this *Chu-hsien* must be explained. Seemingly, it renders a native pronunciation **Jusen*, but this need not have been the pronunciation of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The first Jučen character used in the name does not occur elsewhere, but its original value was probably **jur-*, not *ju-*. As to the second character, it is also used as the second element of the Jučen word meaning «kettle», transcribed phonetically 木先 *mu-hsien* (GRUBE, No. 244), **musen*. But the same word is transcribed 木徹 *mu-ch'é*, **muče*, in the Sino-Jučen Vocabulary of the Board of Interpreters acquired by AUROUSSEAU for the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, and the corresponding word in Manchu is *mučen*. We may therefore safely conclude that the forms in *-sen* are due to dialectical variations or to an unsatisfactory notation of the Board of Translators, but that the true Jučen forms were *Jürčen* (? > **Jüčen* > *Jusen*) and *mučen*, respectively.

The late form **Jusen* receives apparent support from a Manchu word. In his preface to the *Man-chou yüan-liu k'ao*, the Emperor Ch'ien-lung says: «When the Dynasty was founded, the ancient name which designated those belonging to the 滿珠 *Man-chu* was 珠申 *Chu-shên*; later, this name [*Chu-shên*] was changed to *Man-chu* (*Man-ju*), but in the end the Chinese characters [*Man-chu*] became altered to 滿洲 *Man-chou*. The truth is that the ancient [name] 肅慎 *Su-shên* is a phonetical change from *Chu-shên*, and this gives an additional proof in favour of the territorial identity [of the *Su-shên* and the *Man-chu*].» DEVÉRIA's translation (*Rev. de l'Extrême-Orient*, I, 174-175) is somewhat different, but would imply that the text is self-contradictory (cf. moreover I, 3a). Ch'ien-lung's assertion that the Chinese characters were