

« altered » means that it was Man-chu which correctly rendered Manju, and that, if *chou* was commonly substituted for *chu*, it was because *chou*, « island », lent itself better in Chinese to a geographical use (cf. I, 1 b, 2 a; as a matter of fact, the very name « Manju », unknown before the seventeenth century, has never been satisfactorily explained; cf. GIBERT. *Dictionnaire*, 589, 602-603). I shall speak of the ancient Su-shên farther on; but it is self-evident that if there should be a connection between Su-shên and Chu-shên, the chronology would require a process of evolution just the opposite of that formulated by Ch'ien-lung (the text in ch. I, 3 a, is in this respect more logical than Ch'ien-lung's preface).

There can be no doubt that the name Chu-shên adduced by Ch'ien-lung in connection with Su-shên and said by the compilers of the *Man-chou yuan-liu k'ao* (I, 3 a) to be fundamentally identical with Chu-li-chên (Jurčen) is the Manchu *jušen*, *juše*, meaning « Manchu servants » and « family people » (cf. ZAKHAROV's *Dictionary*, 1005; TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE, in *JRAS*, 1889, 438). GIBERT (*Dictionnaire*, 141), while admitting that *jušen* was the designation not of the ruling class of the Manchus, but of an inferior class maintained in a state of bondage by the other, accepts the Chinese view which connects the name of the *jušen* with that of the Jurčen (cf. also *Tz'ü yüan*, *ch'ou* 253, s. v. « Nü-chên »). The transcription Chu-hsien, *Jusen, given for the native name of the Jurčen in the late Jučen Vocabulary published by GRUBE, may be adduced as providing an intermediary form. Yet I retain some doubts as to the correctness of the equivalence. Since we have the Manchu *mučen* as corresponding to the **musen* of GRUBE's Vocabulary and to *muče* of the Vocabulary acquired by AUROUSSEAU, we should expect, as the Manchu form corresponding to *Jusen, not *jušen*, but **jučen*. As to the Manchu *jušen* itself, its historical use remains to be investigated, and I am not certain that it ever was, as Ch'ien-lung's text would imply, an ethnical and not a class name. ZAKHAROV's etymology from the Chinese 主人 *chu-jen*, « master », is not acceptable, but we may have to do with an independent Manchu word, unconnected with Jurčen. I am all the more in doubt about any such connection because the very form Jurčen may have survived in Manchu. *Jurčen* in Manchu means « opposition », « disobedience », from a root *jurče-* which has many derived forms. But ZAKHAROV (p. 1014) says that it is also the « name of a clan ». It is true that he says this with a question-mark. But it looks as though he had actually found the name as that of a clan, but felt some hesitation on account of the identity of that name with the word *jurčen*, « disobedience ». If such be the case, the absolute identity of the clan-name Jurčen with the form which we have reconstructed from the various transcriptions for the native name of the Nü-chên would make it certain that it is this native name which has survived as a clan-name in Manchu, and the very doubtful connection proffered between the name of the Jurčen and the Manchu class-name *jušen* should be definitely abandoned.

As to the date of the first occurrence of the name Nü-chên, we have seen (p. 376) that, according to the *San-ch'ao pei-meng hui-pien*, the Ch'i-tan Emperor A-pao-chi was afraid that the Nü-chên might create trouble. This is confirmed by the *Liao shih* (in which work the name always occurs as Nü-chih, as required by the taboo of 1131), where we read (I, 1 a-b) that in 903 A-pao-chi subdued the Nü-chih, and again, in 906, those of the Nü-chih who had not submitted before. But A-pao-chi died on September 18, 926, and it was only under his suc-