

Su-shên play their part in such homage by the side of the Long-legged, the One-armed, and the Three-bodied. Such is the conclusion arrived at by IKEUCHI Hiroshi in a remarkable memoir, *A Study of the Su-shên* (first published in Japanese in Vol. 13 of the *Man-Sen jiri . . . hōkō*, 1-61, but more accessible in English in *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, No. 5, 1930, 97-163), and I can only endorse it. I also concur with IKEUCHI in his further view that the name of the kingdom of Su-shên which reappears under the Six Dynasties in reference to the I-lou and Wu-chi tribes, the last embassy of the Su-shên dating A. D. 559, is not due to any kingdom which really bore that name, but is an archaistic designation of purely Chinese origin. The tradition about the Su-shên, famous on account of a passage in the biography of Confucius, was that they had brought as tribute a certain kind of arrow-head. The I-lou, and later the Wu-chi, were identified with the Su-shên and given their name because they had offered a similar tribute. But there was no longer a Su-shên tribe in the Christian era, and there is not the slightest chance that this half-legendary name should have survived, even if the two were not phonetically irreconcilable, in that of the Nü-shên or *Ĵurčen.

Another attempt has been made to connect the name of the *Ĵurčen with forms known in other times and in other regions. In his *Studien zur vergleichenden Grammatik der Türk-sprachen* (SPAW, 1916, 1239), BANG drew attention to Čürčüt and Šüršüt (< *Čürčüt), which is a Turkish name of the Mongols among the Kurdak and the Kirghiz respectively. I am not aware of the exact value of these forms, nor of the extent to which they were or are in use; it may, however, be that this Čürčüt was also the form used among the Mongols in the second half of the last century, since GOMBOEV, himself a Mongol, transcribed as «Ĵurcut» the name which he found written Ĵurčit in the *Altan tobči* (cf. p. 367). In any case, it does not seem open to doubt that this Čürčüt or Šüršüt is the outcome, with a new ascription, of the Mongol name Ĵürčät of the *Ĵurčen.

But BANG goes farther, and proffers two other assumptions with which I must disagree. One, which he expressed in *Túrán* (Nos. 6-7 [1918], 437), is that Čürčüt is a plural of čürčü, čurču, a word occurring in various Turkish dialects with the meaning «brother-in-law»; but there is not the slightest likelihood that the *Ĵurčen should have owed their native name to a dialectical Turkish word, unattested moreover in Uighur or in Mongolian.

BANG's second suggestion (SPAW, 1916, 1239), which requires more detailed comment, is that Čürčüt, identical on the one hand with the name of the *Ĵurčen, represents at the same time «the Chinese designation Dzut-Dzut of the Avars»; for this last form, he refers to DE GROOT, in MARQUART, *Ueber das Volkstum der Komanen*, 87. These «Dzut-Dzut» are the same which we generally call Juan-juan, and a connection between «Juan-juan» and «*Ĵurčen» had already been proposed by BLOCHET, in a note to which I have alluded in *JA*, 1920, I, 147, but which I cannot trace at present. DE GROOT's remarks were to the effect that 蠕蠕 Juan-juan, «on account of its phonetic element, could only be pronounced 'Dzu-Dzu'», so that «the usual pronunciation Juan-juan must be abandoned». In my review of MARQUART's book (*JA*, 1920, I, 143-144) I replied that the most ancient Chinese dictionaries register the reading *juan* for 蠕, that the name Juan-juan still occurs in the *Liao shih* (116, 15 b) with a phonetic gloss indicating that very pronunciation, and that moreover the Chinese consider 蠕 *juan* as another graphic