

cf. Tōkyō *Tripit.* of Meiji, 爲, ix, 78 b, 81 b; *juan* means «to wriggle like worms»). The *Nan shih*, which is a general history of the southern dynasties, always speaks of the «Juan-juan», that is to say gives the northern form of the name (4, 7 a; 6, 12 a; 7, 5 a; 79, 6 b-8 a), though, in the corresponding passages, the original dynastic histories spoke of the Jui-jui and Ju-ju respectively. But this must be due to the fact that Li Yen-shou († c. 676-678), the author of the *Nan shih*, was also the author of the *Pei shih* devoted to the northern dynasties, in which he naturally employed the «northern» form Juan-juan, and he wanted to use for the same people the same form in both works (Hu San-hsing's remark, reproduced in the *K'ang-hsi tzū-tien*, s. v. *jui*, that the *Nan shih* employs Jui-jui is erroneous. Juan-juan and the allied forms have been discussed by FUJITA in *Tōyō gakuhō*, XIII [1923], 64, 68, but I do not think that any point of his argument can be retained).

FRANKE maintains (III, 283, 291) that Jou-jan is a purely Chinese term, meaning «weak», «flexible», and that the depreciatory designation Juan-juan, created by T'o-pa Tao, was chosen in phonetic agreement with Jou-jan; moreover he writes this new name as «蠕蠕 J(o)u-juan», and in the course of his work always speaks of the «Jou-juan». But this is quite arbitrary, since no ancient source makes a distinction between the two components of Juan-juan, always written 蠕蠕, and since in no system, even if we should admit of such a distinction, is either of the two characters ever read *jou*. Finally, FRANKE, like DE GROOT, lays stress on the graphic composition of the characters, and on that account asserts that the original pronunciation of 蠕 can have only been *ju*, which he finds indicated as a secondary reading in the *Chi yün* of the eleventh century. In the same way GILES, in the second edition of his *Chinese-English Dictionary*, gives Ju-ju as a possible pronunciation instead of Juan-juan (cf. also SCHLEGEL's similar opinion in MARQUART's *Erānšahr*, 54). But the same *Chi yün*, in the case of the nation which we call Juan-juan, says that 蠕 is the same as 蠕, and for 蠕, the phonetic element of which moreover is *juan*, the dictionaries give no other pronunciation than *juan* (FRANKE's statement to the contrary, III, 284, is due to the fact that he inadvertently misread 竟 *yen*, **iwän*, as 兌 *tui*, **d'uâi*). The interchange of phonetics between 蠕 *juan* and 蠕 *juan* is paralleled by the indifferent use of 擗 and 擗, 擗 and 擗, etc. Accordingly, Ju-ju as well as J(o)u-juan is erroneous, and we must retain the pronunciation Juan-juan as it is given in the dictionaries since the T'ang period, and confirmed by phonetic glosses ranging from Tu Yu's *T'ung tien* of the end of the eighth century (196, 5 a) to the *Liao shih* of the fourteenth.

FRANKE believes on the one hand that Jou-jan is a purely Chinese name, and Juan-juan a derisive deformation of Jou-jan, while on the other he admits (III, 290-291) a probable semantic connection of these names with that of *Κερμυχῶνες*, or «Worm-Chionites», as suggested by MARQUART and accepted by CHAVANNES (*Doc. sur les Tou-kiue*, 232). He is thus led to believe that the meaning of «flexible», «wriggling like worms», attached to a native name which would be no other than the very name «Avar». I agree only with part of this argument. «Jou-jan» makes sense in Chinese, as the later Juan-juan does, but so does also 茝 茝 Jui-jui which, with another ancient pronunciation (**ńźi'äi-ńźi'äi*, not **ńźi'ät-ńźi'ät*), is an old Chinese term meaning «flourishing vegetation». The 茹 *ju* of Ju-ju has, among other senses, the meaning «flexible», and, in the commentary to the well-known *Li sao* of Ch'ü Yüan, it is explained as 柔擗 *jou-juan*