

of Scanderoon to the Amur and the Yellow Sea. The vast empire which Chinghiz had conquered still owned a nominally supreme head in the Great Kaan,* but practically it was splitting up into several great monarchies under the descendants of the four sons of Chinghiz, Juji, Chaghatai, Okkodai, and Tuli; and wars on a vast scale were already brewing between them. Hulaku, third son of Tuli, and brother of two Great Kaans, Mangku and Kúblái, had become practically independent as ruler of Persia, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, and Armenia, though he and his sons, and his sons' sons, continued to stamp the name of the Great Kaan upon their coins, and to use the Chinese seals of state which he bestowed upon them. The Seljukian Sultans of Iconium, whose dominion bore the proud title of Róm (Rome), were now but the struggling bondsmen of the Ilkhans. The Armenian

The various Mongol Sovereign-ties in Asia and Eastern Europe.

* We endeavour to preserve throughout the book the distinction at was made in the age of the Mongol Empire between *Khán* and *Ḳaán* (خان and قآن, as written by Arabic and Persian authors). The former may be rendered *Lord*, and was applied generally to Tartar chiefs whether sovereign or not; it has since become in Persia, and especially in Afghanistan, a sort of "Esq.," and in India is now a common affix in the names of (Musulman) Hindustanis of all classes; in Turkey alone it has been reserved for the Sultan. *Ḳaán*, again, appears to be a form of *Khákán*, the *Xayávos* of the Byzantine historians, and was the peculiar title of the supreme sovereign of the Mongols; the Mongol princes of Persia, Chaghatai, etc., were entitled only to the former affix (*Khán*), though *Ḳaán* and *Khákán* are sometimes applied to them in adulation. Polo always writes *Kaan* as applied to the Great Khan, and does not, I think, use *Khan* in any form, styling the subordinate princes by their name only, as *Argon*, *Alau*, etc. *Ilkhan* was a special title assumed by Huláku and his successors in Persia; it is said to be compounded from a word *Il*, signifying tribe or nation. The relation between *Khán* and *Khákán* seems to be probably that the latter signifies "*Khán of Kháns*," Lord of Lords. Chinghiz, it is said, did not take the higher title; it was first assumed by his son Okkodai. But there are doubts about this. (See *Quatremère's Rashid*, pp. 10 *seqq.*, and *Pavet de Courteille, Dict. Turk-Oriental.*) The tendency of swelling titles is always to degenerate, and when the value of Khan had sunk, a new form, *Khán-khánán*, was devised at the Court of Delhi, and applied to one of the high officers of state.

[Mr. Rockhill writes (*Rubruck*, p. 108, note): "The title *Khan*, though of very great antiquity, was only used by the Turks after A.D. 560, at which time the use of the word *Khatun* came in use for the wives of the Khan, who himself was termed *Ilkhan*. The older title of *Shan-yü* did not, however, completely disappear among them, for Albiruni says that in his time the chief of the Ghuz Turks, or Turkomans, still bore the title of *Jenuyeh*, which Sir Henry Rawlinson (*Proc. R. G. S.*, v. 15) takes to be the same word as that transcribed *Shan-yü* by the Chinese (see *Ch'ien Han shu*, Bk. 94, and *Chou shu*, Bk. 50, 2). Although the word *Khakhan* occurs in Menander's account of the embassy of Zemarchus, the earliest mention I have found of it in a Western writer is in the *Chronicon* of Albericus Trium Fontium, where (571), under the year 1239, he uses it in the form *Cacanus*."—Cf. *Terrien de Lacouperie, Khan, Khakan, and other Tartar Titles*. Lond., Dec. 1888.—H. C.]