

in YS, 15, 4 *a* (for the alternation of *-a-* and *-u-* in the middle unaccentuated syllable, see « Abaga »). Samayār had been sent to Syria in 1271, and he is the « Cemakar » of a letter sent by Abaya on September 4, 1271, to Prince Edward of England (the future Edward I), then at Acre (cf. the text in Th. STAPPLETON, *Cronica maiorum et vicecomitum Londoniarum*, London, 1846, 143; also *Arch. Or. Latin*, I, 623; wrongly « Camaker » in RÖHRICHT, *Regesta Regni Hierosol.*, 359, where « Than Albaga » stands of course for « Chan Abaga »).

To the usual references, add HOWORTH, III, 237, quoting the Georgian chronicle (BROSSET, *Hist. de la Géorgie*, I, I, 580-581), but I do not see how the « Sikudar » of that chronicle could represent « Samayār ». The name is written صمأى Šamāyu in Mufazzal's very faulty text; BLOCHET (*Moufazzal*, 203) is absolutely wrong in looking for etymologies of « Samayu » and « Samayan » which are mere wrong readings (confusion of ص and س with ج); and it is not true that Mong. *sama'ur* or *samna'ur*, « curry-comb » (derived from *sam*, « comb »), is a late form of \**samayār*. I do not know the etymology of the name Samayār; a connection with *sama'u*, « disorder », is possible, but remains to be proved.

### 329. SANGON, and see LIITAN SANGON

This title appears only once, in « Liitan Sangon » (see « Liitan »), and is certainly *sängün*. All commentators, from *Pa*, 442, and *Y*, II, 138, to *RR*, 425, and *B*<sup>1</sup>, 444, excepting *Ch*, III, 12, have explained *sängün* as being Ch. 將軍 *chiang-chün*, « general ». And it is true that, when we find *sänün* (*sängün*) for the first time in the 8th cent. in a Turkish runic inscription of the Orkhon, it must have been borrowed simply from *chiang-chün*. But the case is no longer the same in the Mongol period, during which *chiang-chün* was rarely used (CORDIER's addition to *Y*, II, 138, about « military governor » refers to the revival of the title of *chiang-chün* during the Manchu dynasty as a title for Tartar military governors; it is irrelevant here). On the contrary, both as a proper name and as a title, *sänggün* or *sänggüm* is then of rather frequent occurrence in transcriptions, and Rašidu-'d-Dīn, as I have already remarked in *TP*, 1930, 46, explains it as meaning « men of good origin », « sons of the aristocracy » (*ḥudāvand zādāh*, in *Ber*, I, 98). This can only be 相公 *hsiang-kung*, which in ancient China was an epithet used for ministers (« Duke minister »), but in the Middle Ages was applied to young men of high families; it is well known that the term has now much deteriorated in Northern Chinese. In the 13th cent., *hsiang-kung*, without being an official term, is frequently met with in Chinese texts as a polite designation for high officials who were neither ministers (*ch'êng-hsiang*), nor assistant-ministers (*yu-ch'êng*, *tso-ch'êng*). For instance, in a diary of 1276, we find a mention of Bayan *ch'êng-hsiang*, of 'Ali[-bäg] *yu-ch'êng*, but of Po-lo[-huan] *hsiang-kung* (*TP*, 1915, 396, 403), Po-lo[-huan] being one of the generals under Bayan's command during his campaign against the Sung (cf. *Ch*, III, 33-34). In the same work, the author notes that he stayed a certain day in the house of Yen *hsiang-kung* (*TP*, 1912, 432; see also « Tundinfu »); the Yen family enjoyed in Tung-p'ing-fu a situation similar to that of Li T'an in Shan-tung. The well-known Činqai is mentioned as Chên-hai *hsiang-kung* in YS, 95, 14 *a*. In *The Ts'ai Yüan P'ei Anniv. Volume*, Peiping, 1934, 926, I have quoted two cases where a man