

# A Study on the Titles Kaghan and Katun

by

KURAKICHI SHIRATORI

I

## The Origin of the Title *Kaghan*.

Numerous are the titles of honour and authority which have been adopted by the peoples of north Asia, but the one which is the most conspicuous is perhaps *khan* or *kaghan*, because it began to appear in comparatively early times and nevertheless is still found in survival. It is not only noteworthy on account of its long continuance, but also of its being a famous name in history. Yet, so far as I am aware, no sufficient researches have been carried out to know at what period and among what tribe or race it originated. Therefore my present study on the title and its companion will begin with the investigation of its origin.

In the *Ti-chi* 帝紀 in the *Wei-shu* 魏書, there is a brief mention of an ancestor of the T'o-po family 拓跋氏 by the name of Sha-mo-han 沙漠汗. The last syllable of the name, *han*, might seem to be as remarked by PARKER, the title *khan* attached to the individual name, which was Sha-mo. Elsewhere in history, however, we find that this barbarian as a prince was sent to China by his father Li-wei 力微 in the 2nd year of *Ching-yüan* 景元 of Wei 魏 (261 A.D.). So if we were to recognize the title *khan* in his name, we should have to admit that it was already used among the northern peoples at the end of the Three Kingdom Age (264 A.D.), which is of course very improbable. The name in question, then, must have been an individual name as a whole, as F.W.K. MÜLLER suggested, presumably a transcription from Saborgan or such like in the Manchurian language.<sup>1)</sup>

BRETSCHNEIDER, an authority on the topographical and ethnical aspects of the northern frontagers of China during the Yüan and Ming periods, called attention to an incident in history in which a certain T'o-po chief named I-li Khan assisted China in repelling the Hiung-nu 匈奴 invasion in 312 A.D., supposing it to be the first instance in which the title *khan* ever appeared in

1) Uigurische Glossen, *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 1919-20 (*Festschrift für F. Hirth*), p. 313, Anm. 1.

Chinese annals.<sup>1)</sup> The year 312 is identified with the 6th year of *Yung-chia* 永嘉 under Huai-ti 懷帝 of Western Chin 西晉 and the T'ò-po chieftain who was flourishing at that time south of the Yin-shan Mountains 陰山 is known to be no other person than I-lu 猗盧. Undoubtedly BRETSCHNEIDER'S I-li Khan was a misrepresentation of this I-lu. Now, the 6th year of *Yung-chia* of China was coincident with the 2nd year of the *Chia-p'ing* 嘉平, when Liu Ts'ung 劉聰 ruled the north regions. It is recorded in the *Wei-shu* as an event of the latter year that his army was defeated by T'ò-po I-lu who fought in alliance with the Chinese general Liu Kun 劉琨, and in this we recognize the so-called I-li Khan repulsing the invaders of China. But it does not appear in history that he was *khan* at all. The *Wei-shu* shows that he was posthumously entitled Mu Huang-ti 穆皇帝 over and above the denominations Great *Shan-yü* 大單于 and Lord of Tai 代公, which he received from Huai-ti in the 3rd year of the reign; nevertheless there is not the slightest hint that he was ever called *khan* or *kaghan*.

A still more doubtful case presents itself in a paragraph in the *Tzu-chih-t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑, which seems to tell us that the T'ò-po tribe knew the title *Kaghan* even at the time of its founder. For it reads: "This year (the 2nd year of *Ching-yüan*), T'ò-po Li-wei 拓跋力微, head of the So-tou tribe 索頭部 of the Hsien-pei race 鮮卑, sent his son Sha-mo-han 沙漠汗 to pay tribute for the first time to the Chinese court, which therefore detained him as hostage. Li-wei's ancestors had abided within the north desert regions, never coming into intercourse with China. With the appearance of K'ò-han (*Kaghan*) Mao 可汗毛 however, the tribe gained power, he himself ruling 36 countries, which included 99 larger clans. Five generations after, K'ò-han Tui-yin 可汗推寅 migrated southward to Ta-tse 大澤, great swamp, and then seven generations passed before K'ò-han (*Kaghan*) Lin 可汗鄰."<sup>2)</sup> The exact time of the so-called K'ò-han Mao is not known, but seeing his descendant by 14 generations Li-wei lived in the 2nd year of *Ching-yüan* of Wei, i.e. 261 A.D., and counting thence fourteen generations back, we reach a rough estimate that he was living about 151 A.D., which was the 5th year of the Later Era 後五年 of the Han emperor Wên-ti 文帝. Now we must remember it was an age marked by the Hiung-nu predominance over the north regions, when her Chün-ch'ên Shan-yü 軍臣單于 was unmistakably the sole mighty sovereign outside the Wall, and we find it hard to believe that a mere chieftain of the T'ò-po should have assumed such a title as *kaghan* in the face of the Great *Shan-yü*. In all probability, K'ò-han 可汗 of "K'ò-han Mao" 可汗毛 was no more than a retrospective appellation by history.

1) *Mediaeval Researches*, I, p. 239, note 602.

2) 是歲(景元二年)鮮卑索頭部大人拓跋力微始遣其子沙漠汗入貢,因留爲質,力微之先,世居北荒,不交南夏,至可汗毛,始疆大,統國三十六,大姓九十九,後五世至可汗推寅,南遷大澤,又七世至可汗鄰。

Finding it hard to recognize the title *kaghan* in the names of the old T'ö-po chiefs, we must seek the object of our researches in later history. There is in the *Hsien-pei T'u-yü-hun Chuan* 鮮卑吐谷渾傳 in the *Sung-shu* 宋書 a passage which I thought was very enlightening. It relates how Tu-yü-hun 吐谷渾, the founder of the tribe bearing his name, revered himself from his younger brother Mu-yung Kuei 慕容廆. He himself was a bastard, while the younger brother was the legitimate heir. At first their horses pastured together, but one day a fight occurred between the herds. As this angered the younger brother, Tu-yü-hun started westward with his animals to run away from him. Mu-yung Kuei, however, repents of his own wrath, and sends his chief steward to bring back the departing brother. Tu-yü-hun is overtaken, and implored to return, he promises to do so only if his horses will allow themselves to be taken back. The messenger is rejoiced, and bows reverently, saying, "Ch'u, K'o-han" 處可寒, which means "Yes, Emperor," as the history explains. Now he tries to turn back the animals with a large force of horsemen he had brought with him, but in vain. At last he gives way, and kneels down crying, "K'o-han 可寒, this is no human affair."<sup>1)</sup> The same story is also told in the *Wei-shu*<sup>2)</sup> and the *Pei-shi* 北史;<sup>3)</sup> only, in these books, the title addressed to Tu-yü-hun is written 可汗 *k'o-han*, apparently another transcription from the same original.

Now if we are to believe this story just as it is, we shall have to admit that the title *kaghan* was used among the Hsien-pei tribes at the time of Mu-yung Kuei. This, however, requires further consideration. According to his biography in the *Tsai-chi* 載記 in the *Chin-shu* 晉書, Mu-yung Kuei was born in the 5th year of *T'ai-shih* 泰始 of the Chin emperor Wu-ti 武帝 (269 A.D.), and died in the 8th year of *Hsien-ho* 咸和 of the Eastern Chin emperor Ch'eng-ti 成帝 (333 A.D.). Out of the 65 years of his life he reigned for 49 years. He declared himself Great *Shan-yü* of the Hsien-pei race in the 1st year of *Yung-chia* 永嘉 (307 A.D.) and received from Yüan-ti 元帝, in the 1st year of *Chien-wu* 建武 (317 A.D.), the denominations of Great *Shan-yü* and Lord of Ch'ang-li 昌黎公;<sup>4)</sup> but in spite of all that,

1) Chap. 96, p. 1, edition of Chi ku ko 汲古閣: 阿柴虜吐谷渾, 遼東鮮卑也, 父奔洛韓有二子, 長曰吐谷渾, 少曰若洛廆, 若洛廆別爲慕容氏, 渾廆長, 廆正嫡, 父在時分七百戶與渾, 渾與廆二部, 俱牧馬, 馬鬪相傷, 廆怒遣信謂渾曰, 先公處分與兄異部, 牧馬何不相遠而致鬪爭相傷, 渾曰, 馬是畜生, 食草飲水, 春氣發動, 所以致鬪, 鬪在於馬, 而怒及人邪, 永別甚易, 今當去汝萬里, 於是擁馬西行, 日移一頓, 頓八十里, 經數頓, 廆悔悟自詈責, 遣舊父老及長史乙那樓, 追渾令還, 渾曰, 我乃祖以來, 樹德遼右, 又卜筮之言, 先公有二子, 福祚並流子孫, 我是卑廆, 理無並大, 今以馬致別, 殆天所啓, 諸君試擁馬令東, 若還東, 我當相隨去, 樓喜拜曰, 處可寒, 虜言處可寒, 宋言爾官家也, 即使所從二千騎, 共遮馬令回, 不盈三百步, 欬然悲鳴突走, 聲若頽山, 如是者十餘輩, 一向一遠, 樓力屈, 又跪曰, 可寒, 此非復人事。

2) Chap. 101, p. 5v.

3) Chap. 96, p. 6r.

4) Chap. 108, p. 2r.

there is no evidence to show that he was ever connected with *khan* or *kaghan*. Of his third son Huang 皝, then, the same history mentions that on his succession to his father as master of Liao-tung 遼東, the Chin emperor Ch'êng-ti sent him an envoy in the 9th year of *Hsien-ho* to confer on him the titles of Great *Shan-yü* and Lord of Liao-tung,<sup>1)</sup> but again, we hear nothing of his having ever been called *khan* or *kaghan*. Since Mu-yung Kuei lived from the beginning of Western Chin into the Eastern Chin period, it may be taken for granted that so far as his biography is concerned, the *Chin-shu* is more reliable than the *Sung-shu*; and as we see the former bears no sign of that title having been held by him or any of his successors.

Perhaps *k'o-han* which is applied to Tu-yü-hun in the *Sung-shu* may be regarded as an indication that it was used by the tribe in the Sung age, but no proof that the Hsien-pei race inhabiting Liao-tung knew anything about it. We must moreover consider that the term *k'o-han* is explained by the history as equivalent to the Chinese *kuan-chia* 官家, emperor. Is it thinkable then that the barbaric races on the upper Liao-ho had among them any master potent enough to assume such a lofty name? Even if any, should it not have been rather Mu-yung Kuei, the rightful leader of the tribe, than Tu-yü-hun who was only a bastard? Small is the probability that Tu-yü-hun was really accosted as *kaghan* by his brother's chief steward. Take it, however, as a story that ran among the Tu-yü-hun people in the Sung times, and the founder of their tribe might well be addressed as *kaghan*, by the supreme title then familiar to them.

That the Tu-yü-hun tribe called its master *kaghan* in the Sung age is clear from recorded evidence. A passage in the *Tu-yü-hun Chuan* in the *Chin-shu* says: "Shu-lo-han 樹洛干 became an orphan when nine years old. His widowed mother, a daughter of the Nien family 念氏 and a clever and beautiful woman, was married by Wu-ho-ti 烏紇提. The monarch was so affectionate to her that the government was directed just as she pleased. The boy Shu-lo-han, then ten years old, called himself the royal heir, and at the age of 16, ascending the throne, took command of thousands of families, and going with them back to Mo-ho-ch'uan 莫何川, there declared himself *Ta Shan-yü* and *Tu-yü-hun Wang* 大單于吐谷渾王. His administration was begin, and the people enjoyed peaceful industries. He was called Mou-yin K'o-han 戊寅可汗."<sup>2)</sup> At what period this Mou-yin K'o-han lived we may gather from the following passage in the *Tu-yü-hun Chuan* in the *Sung-shu*: "Shu-lo-han, who was Shih-hsiung's 視熊 son succeeding to the throne declared himself *Ch'e-ch'i Chiang-chün* 車騎將軍. It was in the beginning

1) Chap. 109, p. 2r.

2) Chap. 97, p. 8r: 樹洛干九歲而孤, 其母念氏聰惠有姿色, 烏紇提妻之有寵, 遂專國事, 洛于十歲, 便自稱世子, 年十六嗣立, 率所部數千家, 奔歸莫何川, 自稱大都督車騎大將軍大單于吐谷渾王, 化行所部, 衆庶樂業, 號爲戊寅可汗。

of *I-hsi* 義熙.” The said era was one under An-ti 安帝 of Eastern Chin, beginning with 405 A.D. Thus we are assured that about that date the Tu-yü-hun knew to call their ruler by the name of *kaghan*.

The second evidence of the title appears in the *Tu-yü-hun Chuan* in the *Pei-shü*, as follows “In the 5th year of *T'a-ho* 太和, Shih-yin 拾寅 died and was succeeded by his son Tu-i-hou 度易侯 (481 A.D.).....He died and his son Fu-lien-ch'ou 伏連籌 acceded to the throne.....Hearing of the death of Hsiao Wen 孝文, he sent an envoy for the first time to the Chinese court (499 A.D.).....The new Chinese emperor Hsuan-wu 宣武 issued, at the commencement of his reign, an impeachment of that dereliction.....Hsuan-wu passed away and the era of *Chuen-kuang* 正光 set in (520-525 A.D.).....Fu-lien-ch'ou died and was succeeded by his son K'ua-lü 夸呂, who was the first to call himself *K'o-han* 始自號爲可汗.”<sup>1)</sup> From this we learn that the first Tu-yü-hun ruler to assume the title *kaghan* was not Shu-lo-han, but K'ua-lü, whose reign began after 525 A.D., that is, more than one century later than the former's. This, however, does not disprove that the elder ruler had been called *kaghan* in his life-time, for it is quite possible that while he chose to style himself *Ch'e-chi Ta-chiang-chün* and *Tu-yü-hun Wang* his people called him *kaghan* on account of their high esteem of the gracious master. At all events we may safely believe that K'ua-lü was the first one to assume the title in the history of that tribe.

We have already seen that the title *kaghan* as applied to the founder of the Tu-yü-hun tribe in the *Sung-shu*, indicative as it might seem of its use among the Hsien-pei peoples in the Chin period, was in all probability retrospective and fictitious. What appears to be a parallel instance may be perceived in the following passage from the *Ch'i-fu Kuo-jên Chuan* 乞伏國仁傳 included in the *Tsai-chi* 載記 in the *Chin-shu*: “Ch'i-fu Kuo-jên was a man of the Hsien-pei in Lung-hsi 隴西. Ages ago, there were three tribes named Ju-fu-ssü 如弗斯, Ch'u-lien 出連, and Ch'ih-lu 叱盧. They started from their home north of the desert to cross over to this side of the Yin-shan Mountains. On the way they met a gigantic reptile lying in their path. It was shaped like a divine tortoise and as big as a mound. They sacrificed a horse to this mysterious object, and invoked it, if a good spirit, to open the way for them, and if an evil one to obstruct their passage. Suddenly the monster vanished, and in its place appeared an infant. Now there was in the party an old man of the tribe called Ch'i-fu 乞伏, and being childless, he begged to be allowed adopt the child as his own. His wish was granted, and the aged man, gladdened by the thought that he had at last secured one to depend upon for support, named the youngster Ho-kan 紇干

---

1) Chap. 96, pp. 11-12r: 太和五年拾寅死, 子度易侯立, .....死, 子伏連籌立, .....及孝文崩, 遣使.....宣武初詔責之, .....給宣武世至正光, .....伏連籌死, 子夸呂立, 始自號爲可汗.

which meant “*i-i*” 依倚, support in Chinese. At ten years old, the boy was a brave warrior and an excellent horseman and archer, being able to bend a bow of 500 chin strength. By his valour he won a tremendous influence over the four tribes, and at last they elected him their general chief, giving him the title *Ch'i-fu K'o-han T'o-to Mo-ho* 乞伏可汗託鐸莫何, of which *t'o-to* signified ‘demigod’ 非神非人. One of his descendants Yu-lin 祐鄰, who was ancestor of Kuo-jên by five generations, migrated to Hsia-yüan 夏緣 with 500 families under him in the beginning of *T'ai-shi* (265 A.D.). There the tribe fairly prospered.”<sup>1)</sup>

Judging from the date, given of Yu-lin, the so-called *Ch'i-fu K'o-han* must have lived in some period anterior to Western Chin, perhaps in the Three Kingdom Age or perhaps in the Later Han epoch. But is it really possible that a chieftain of a minor Hsien-pei tribe whose sphere was limited to the north of the desert should have ever borne a title of such dignity as *kaghan*? Moreover, it may even be questioned whether this *Ch'i-han K'o-han* was a historical reality. As I have once observed in my “Study on the Tung-hu Tribes” 東胡民族考,<sup>2)</sup> the Mongol word for “child” was *köbü* or *köbiin*. Very likely *Ch'i-fu* (\**kot-fuk* 乞伏) was the transcription of this term, and this makes us imagine that the story of *Ch'i-fu K'o-han* was a mere fiction which originated from the tribal name. And even if we were to admit him to be a real character, it would still seem exceedingly strange that while the chieftains of various Hsien-pei tribes north of the desert were usually styled *shanyü*, he should alone have borne the title of *kaghan*.

Our next question is whether any of the descendants of *Ch'i-fu K'o-han* was called by that title. The biography of Kuo-jên in the *Chün-shu* tells us that in the 10th year of *T'a-yüan* 太元 of the Eastern Chin emperor Hsiao-wu-ti 孝武帝 (385 A.D.), he declared himself Great *Tu-tu*, Great *Chiang-chün*, Great *Shan-yü* 大都督大將軍大單于, and that Fu Têng 符登 of the Former Ts'in 前秦 sent him by an ambassador the titles of Great *Shan-yü* and King of Yüan-ch'uan 大單于苑川王. As for his son Ch'ien-kuei 乾歸, his biography in the same history shows that he proclaimed himself on the recommendation of his subjects Great *Tu-tu*, Great *Chiang-chün*, and King of Ho-nan 大都督大將軍河南王, in addition to which he received from Fu Chien 苻堅 in the 14th year of *T'a-yüan* (389 A.D.) the titles of Great *Chiang-chün*, Great *Shan-yü*, and King of Chin-ch'eng 大將軍大單于金城

1) Chap. 125, p. 1: 乞伏國仁隴西鮮卑人也, 在昔有如弗斯出連叱盧三部, 自漠北出大陰山, 遇一巨蟲於路, 狀如神龜, 大如陵阜, 乃殺馬而祭之祝曰, 若善神也, 便開路, 惡神也, 遂塞不通, 俄而不見, 乃有一小兒在焉, 時又有乞伏部, 有老父無子者, 請養爲子, 衆咸許之, 老父欣然自以爲有所依憑字之曰乾干, 乾干者夏言依倚也, 年十歲, 驍勇善騎射彎弓五百斤, 四部服其雄武, 推爲統主, 號之曰乞伏可汗託鐸莫何, 託鐸者言非神非人之稱也, 其後有祐鄰者, 卽國仁五世祖也, 秦始初率戶五百, 遷夏緣, 部衆稍盛.

2) Shigaku-Zasshi, XXII, No. 5, p. 90.

王. Nevertheless we do not perceive in either biography any suggestion of *kaghan*.

The State of Western Ts'in 西秦, which was established by Kuo-jên, survived his successors Ch'ien-kuei and Ch'ih-p'an 熾磐, but the next ruler Mu-mo 慕末 had to see it superseded by Hsia 夏 in the 8th year of *Yüan-chia* 元嘉 of the Sung emperor Wên-ti 文帝, viz. 431 A.D. Neither Ch'ih-p'an nor Mu-mo appears in history to have been called *kaghan*. However, that story of Ch'i-fu K'o-han would never have been told so as to find its way into the *Kuo-jên Chuan*, unless *Kaghan* was known as a sovereign title to the people of Ch'ih-p'an, who ruled Western Ts'in about the end of the Eastern Chin epoch.

So far we have ascertained that the title *kaghan* accorded to these earlier chieftains in the *Tu-yü-hun Chuan* and the *Ch'i-fu Chuan*, being only retrospective, was not proof of its being really used either in the Three Kingdom or the Western Chin age. It was first adopted, if we assume Shu-lo-han of the Tu-yü-hun tribe called himself Mou-yin *Kaghan*, in the first year *I-hsi* of An-ti of Eastern Chin, viz. 405 A.D.; while if his descendant K'ua-liü was the first to take it for himself, the date will not be earlier than *Cheng-kuang* Era of Yüan Wei 元魏 (520-525 A.D.). Our researches, however, having been reduced to such late periods in history, there is still other material of about the same age, which has yet to be examined. It is this statement in the *Juan-juan Chuan* 蠕蠕傳 in the *Pei-shi*; "Shê-lun 社崙 now declared himself Tou-tai K'o-han 豆代可汗 (the *Wei-Shu* puts it as Chiu-tou-fa K'o-han 丘豆伐可汗), *tou-tai* 豆代 means in Chinese "governing and expanding" 駕御開帳, and *k'o-han* 'emperor'." 1) The date at which he took the title is not given either in the *Pei-shi* or in the *Wei-shu*. But both provide an account of how he began in the 9th year of *Têng-kuo* 登國 to destroy or subjugate his opponents within the country, and how he succeeded in expanding his dominion in every direction, until "It bordered west on the land of Yen-ch'i 焉耆 and east on that of Korea. It stretched northward across the desert to the edge of Han-hai 瀚海 and reached the great stony land 大磧 to the south. He held his regular court of assembly to the north of Tung-huang 敦煌 and Chang-yeh 張掖 ..... Thereupon he styled himself Tou-tai K'o-han 豆代可汗 ..... In the 5th year of *T'ien-hing* 天興, hearing of Tao-wu 道武 leading an expedition against Yo Hing 姚興, he took the occasion to attack the Chinese border." 2)

This enables us to infer that the title was proclaimed between the 9th year of *Têng-kuo* and the 5th year of *T'ien-hin* (394-402 A.D.), corresponding to the period in Eastern Chin history from the 19th year of *T'a-yüan*

1) Chap. 98, p. 2v.

2) Chap. 98, p. 2v: "其西則焉耆之地, 東則朝鮮之地, 北則渡沙漠, 窮瀚海, 南則臨大磧, 其常所會庭, 敦煌張掖之北, .....於是自號豆代可汗, .....天興五年社崙聞道武征姚興遂犯塞."

of Hsian Wu-ti to the 6th year of *Lung-an* 隆安 of An-ti. Certainly this antedated K'ua-lü's assumption of title, and even Shu-lo-han's association with it. If this observation is justifiable, we may now safely assume that, so far as Chinese records bear witness, the Juan-juan chief Shê-lun was the very first to bear the title. "Here originated the title of *k'o-han*" 可汗之號始於此,<sup>1)</sup> remarked that old author of the *T'ung-tien* 通典, T'u-yu 杜佑, in comment on "Chiu-tou-fa K'o-han" in the *Juan-juan Chuan*, and now we see the correctness of his opinion.

## II

### How *Shan-yü* Was Superseded by *Kaghan*.

Until the title *kagan* appeared among the northern races, its part had been played by *shan-yü* 單于, a title of no less renown in Chinese history. First adopted by a Hiung-nu monarch, it remained for long periods a symbol of honour and authority, assumed by every important master of those regions. That it was an exact equivalent of its successor *kaghan*, is testified by the *T'u-chüeh Chuan* 突厥傳 in the *Pei-shi*, as: T'u-mên 土門 now styled himself I-li K'o-han 伊利可汗, I-li *Kaghan*. *K'o-han* was equal to *shan-yü* of the former times. His wife was called *k'o-ho-tun* (*kaghatum*) 可賀敦, which was equivalent to the old title *ê-shih* 闕氏.<sup>2)</sup> Another testimony is derived from the *T'u-chüeh Chuan* in the *T'ang-shu* 唐書, as: "Having grown great and strong, T'u-mên now assumed the title of *k'o-han* 汗, which corresponded to *shan-yü*, while his wife was styled *k'o-tun* (*katun*) 可敦, a name comparable to *ê-shih*."<sup>3)</sup>

Now the question before us is why that Juan-juan chief Shê-lun, instead of this long-established *shan-yü*, adopted for himself the new style of *kaghan*. The discussion of this problem perhaps will be best opened with an enquiry into the signification of the older title, into its origin and subsequent history. We see its denotation sufficiently explained in the *Hiung-nu Chuan* 匈奴傳 in the *Han-shu* 漢書 where it reads: "The monarch was Luan-ti 攣鞮 by family name. The people called him Ch'êng-li Ku-t'u Shan-yü 撐犁孤塗單于. The Hiung-nu call heaven Ch'êng-li and son Ku-t'u. *Shan-yü* is vastness 廣大之貌. It symbolizes the vastness of heaven 象天單于然."<sup>4)</sup>

1) Chap. 196, p. 15v.

2) Chap. 99, p. 2v: 土門遂自號伊利可汗, 猶古之單于也, 號其妻爲可賀敦, 亦猶古之闕氏也.

3) Chap. 215, p. 4r: 吐門遂疆大, 號可汗, 猶單于也, 妻曰可敦, 猶闕氏也.

4) Chap. 94 a, p. 4v: 單于姓攣鞮氏, 其國稱之曰撐犁孤塗單于, 匈奴謂天爲撐犁, 謂子爲孤塗, 單于者廣大之貌也, 言其象天單于然也. Toyo-Gakuho, III. p. 180.



This explanation seems to leave no doubt, and we now proceed to investigate whether the term *shan-yü* is traceable in any existent language or dialect. This problem, so far as I know, has never been satisfactorily solved, though attacked by this time by many orientalists.

To ascertain the etymology of the term, we must first know what was the pronunciation in the Han age of those transcribing characters 單 (*shan*) and 于 (*yü*). For the first character, the *K'ang-hsi-tzu-tien* 康熙字典 shows two archaic sounds: 丹 (*tan*) and 善 (*shen* or *žen*). On the other hand, we see the *Hiung-nu Chuan* in the *Han-shu* say, in the paragraph relating to the 2nd year of *T'ien-fêng* 天鳳, as follows: “匈奴 the Hiung-nu were called 恭奴 (*kung-nu*, obedient servants) and 單于 as 善于 (*shen-yü* or *žen-yü*).” This narrows the above alternative, enabling us to say the character 單 in the transcribed title was pronounced in that period either *žen* or *shen*, but not *tan*. Then to the other character 于 the same lexicography just consulted gives two different sounds: firstly *ü* or *yü* (phonetic spelling 羽俱切), secondly *hü* (phonetic spelling 休居切); and in this case we have nothing to guide our choice. Upon the hypothesis, however, that the whole title was pronounced *žen-hü*, once I ventured to relate it to the Mongolic word *činggis* and to the Chagatai *žengis*. But later on I paid more attention to the Manchurian words *saniyambi* (stretch, extend; ausdehnen, austrecken) and *saniyan* (extention, Ausdehnung). That term which formed the Hiung-nu title, supposing it was pronounced as *shen-yü* or *shan-yü*, seemed to resemble most closely this *saniyan*; although there was also the Mongolic *suniya-χu* denoting the same idea, while those tongues of the Turkish family, Uigur, Chagatai, Osman, etc. expressed the action of stretching a hand by *sun*, which was in reality but a transformation from that Mongolic word.

Not entirely satisfied with this etymology, however, I turned again to the *Han-shu* to consider anew the interpretation of *shan-yü* provided there. The result was the suspicion which occurred to me that the term was not indigenous to the race. We may now observe how the explanation in the history is worded. First it interprets the fore part of the compound title, saying: “The Hiung-nu call heaven *ch'êng-li* and son *ku-t'u*” 謂天爲撐犁謂子孤塗。 This context might have been naturally followed by something like “They speak of vastness as *shan-yü*,” if that was really what was meant. Such impression is inevitable from the general tenor of the original text. As we see, however, the next phrase is: “*Shan-yü* is vastness” 單于者廣大之貌也。 Certainly this is not the same thing as to say that they called vastness *shan-yü*; and therefore it is left open to doubt at least whether *shan-yü* was a Hiung-nu term as truly as *ch'êng-li* or *ku-t'u*. But immediately below we read: “It symbolizes the *shan-yü jan* 單于然 of heaven 言其象天單于然也,” as if *shan-yü* 單于 were a Chinese attributive denoting vastness. Was not the term *shan-yü* so used really Chinese? Did

it not convey as such the idea of vastness? To answer this question, let us look up each of the component characters in the etymological classics. According to the *K'ang-hsi-tsu-t'ien*, the *Shuo-wen* 說文 gives to 單 the definition of 大 (large, great). Then the *Chi-yin* 集韻 shows that 于 sounds *yü* (phonetic spelling 邕俱切) and denotes vastness. It seems now clear that *shan-yü* 單于 was a Chinese phrase expressive of vastness and grandeur, its pronunciation in those ages being either *žen-yü* or *shen-yü*.

At first sight it might appear curious that the sovereign title of the Hiung-nu race should have consisted in Chinese words. But this is by no means a unique case, as may be known from the examination of another Hiung-nu title *Kü-tz'u* 居次, which was applied to the daughter of a *Shan-yü*. This might seem traceable to the Turkish words *kyz* and *kiz*; but knowing that its transcription 居次 was pronounced in the Han period probably as *kü-tsü* or *kö-chü*, we cannot ignore the too wide difference between the vowels which come into comparison. Moreover, if the original term had been really *kiz* or something with similar sound, it would have been represented by some single character with the entering tone 入聲, such, for instance, as 吉 (*kit*) or 黠 (*ket*), as was customary in the Chinese transcription of such foreign monosyllables. What is noteworthy on the other hand is YNE SHI-KU's 顏師古 note on that passage in the *Hiung-nu Chuan* in the *Han-shu*<sup>1)</sup> where the two princesses born to Wan Shao-chün 王昭君 as wife of Fu-chu-lo Shan-yü 復株累單于 are mentioned as Hsü-pu Kü-tz'u 須卜居次 and Tang-yü Kü-tz'u 當于居次. "According to Li-ch'i 李奇," the annotator says, "*Kü-tz'u* 居次 means 'princess,' like the Chinese term *Kung-chu* 公主." We are reasonably led to believe that *kü-tz'u* was, as suggested by Dr. MIYAZAKI,<sup>2)</sup> nothing but a corruption of the Chinese *Kung-chu*, just as was the case with the Mongolian word *güingzü*.<sup>3)</sup>

1) Chap. 94 b, p. 7v.

2) Shigaku-Zasshi XVIII. No. 7, p. 721.

3) Another similar instance we seem to have in *hu-yü* 護于, the title which Wu-chu-liu Shan-yü 烏珠留單于 is recorded to have adopted to replace *Tso Hsien-wang* 左賢王. The latter title was peculiar to the senior heir of a *Shan-yü*, and appears in history also as *tso tu-ch'i* (or *chu-k'i*) *wang* 左屠耆王, *tu-ch'i* being the Hiung-nu equivalent to *hsien* (賢 wise). "In his life time," says the *Hiung-nu Chuan* in the *Han-shu*, "Wu-chu-liu Shan-yü had so frequently the misfortune of losing by death his *Tso Tu-ch'i-wang* that at last he decided the title was ill-omened and therefore ordered it to be changed to *hu-yü* 護于. This was a name of high dignity, only next to *shan-yü* itself. The *Shan-yü* now conferred it on his eldest son, with the intention of making him successor to the monarchy. This caused Han 咸 to resent the *Shan-yü*'s denunciation of his title and refusal to make him his heir. When this Han came to the throne, therefore, he put an end to the title of *hu-yü* to reestablish that of *tu-ch'i-wang*" (Chap. 94, p. 17v: 烏珠留單于在時, 左賢王數死, 以爲其號不祥, 更易命左賢王曰護于, 護于之尊最貴, 次當爲單于, 故烏珠留單于, 授其長子以爲護于, 欲傳以國, 咸怨烏珠留單于貶賤已號, 不欲傳國, 及立貶護于爲左屠耆王。) It can be easily imagined from the above circumstances how *hu-yü*, when first adopted, was intended to be a name even more pretentious than its predecessor.

No doubt such borrowing of a Chinese title was prompted by the affectation of Han civilization on the part of the barbarians. For the same reason, they also imitated an appendage of a Chinese title through translation. According to the same history of the race, Hu-han-hsieh Shan-yü 呼韓邪單于 liked so much the Han custom of prefixing to the posthumous title of an emperor the character *hsiao* 孝, which signified filial piety, that he enacted that the sovereign title of the Hiung-nu should be crowned with *jo-ti* 若鞮, which was the vernacular for *hsiao* 孝, and thus gave rise to the form "So-and-so Jo-ti Shan-yü."<sup>1)</sup>

After these observations, it will be only natural to expect that the Hiung-nu sovereign title was derived from the Chinese language. The additional title *Ch'êng-ti ku-t'u* 撐犁孤塗, bearing the sense of "son of heaven" as we have seen, was obviously the direct version of the Chinese imperial title *t'ien-tzū* 天子, son of heaven, as was the case with *deva-putra*, which the Ta-yüeh-chi 大月氏 after their invasion of India adopted for their master as the vernacular equivalent of *t'ien-tzū*. And *shan-yü* itself, we may now believe, was adopted in imitation of the Chinese supreme title *huang-ti* 皇帝 (emperor), which is known to imply the sense of vastness as does *shan-yü*. The title of *huang-ti* began with Shih-huang-ti of Ts'in 秦始皇帝 when he had annihilated the Six Powers and established a united rule over China, that is in the 26th year of his reign (221 B.C.). The title *shan-yü*, being an imitation of *huang-ti*, must have dated later than that. According to the *Shih-chi* 史記, the Hiung-nu chief who was contemporaneous with Shih-huang-ti was Tou-man 頭曼, and so far as chronology goes, he might have borne the title. History shows, however, the Hiung-nu people at his period were in no enviable condition. With the Tung-hu tribe 東胡 on the east and the Yüeh-chi 月氏 on the west, they had a hard struggle for existence. On the south, moreover, they were threatened by the Ts'in force pushing out from within the Wall, and in the end we see them giving way and flying far northward across the desert. When the nation was in such a plight, it is hardly conceivable that their master should have assumed a title so dignified as to be equal to *huang-ti*.

At the time of his son Mau-tun 冒頓, however, things were very different. The great Ts'in Empire was staggering, the desperate conflict between the Han 漢 and Ch'ü 楚 States having thrown the country into chaos. This was Mau-tun's opportunity. He began by crushing his powerful neighbours Tung-hu and Yüeh-chi, followed it up with the speedy conquest

---

Looking at its Chinese transcription, we may notice that the character *hü* 護 means "guard," enabling us to read *hu-yü* 護于 as "guard of hü," that is of a *Shan-yü*, another example of a Hiung-nu title formed in the Chinese Language.

1) *Han shu*, Chap. 94 b, p. 18r: 匈奴謂孝曰若鞮, 自呼韓邪後與漢親密, 見漢諡帝爲孝慕之, 故皆爲若鞮.

of the whole desert regions, and then went to attack the Chinese frontier. The Han army meeting him were defeated and their master Kao-tsu 高祖 was surrounded at Pai-têng 白登. He was so utterly discomfited that to save himself he had to pay tribute and give a princess in marriage to the Hiung-nu invader. Such was Mau-tun's success in defying the Han supremacy. Outside the Wall he had already subjugated every rival power and annexed all the outlying districts, an achievement parallel to that of Shih-huang-ti when he overthrew the Six Powers and brought the country under one rule; and now he was proudly opposing himself to the Han emperor. It is very probable that at this time and under such circumstances he adopted *shan-yü* as his own title, because it signified the same thing as *huang-ti* and was thought sufficiently dignified for his mighty position. Thus we may assume that the title dated from Mau-tun, notwithstanding the presence in history of "Tou-man Shan-yü," as his father was called in the *Shi-chi* and the *Han-shu*, undoubtedly through the retrospective application of the title.

We have learned that *shan-yü* was a term which signified the vastness of heaven. As a title it must have conveyed the idea of the function of a great monarch of protecting and governing just as the firmament covered creation. In such conception it was just like the Chinese title of *huang-ti*, and when Mau-tun Shan-yü, in a message addressed to Wên-ti, styled himself, as the *Hiung-nu Chuan* in the *Han-shu* shows, "Hiung-nu Great *Shan-yü*, by heaven's ordainment" or "Hiung-nu Great *Shan-yü* created by heaven and earth, assigned by the sun and the moon,"<sup>1)</sup> we may easily imagine what was his pride in his own title and how he insisted on holding it as high as the addressee's.

This paramount status of the title may be also gauged by the standard of the other conspicuous title *wang*, observing how it was used by the same people. The son or younger brother of a *Shan-yü* who had been acknowledged as the royal heir was called Tu-ch'ü-wang 屠耆王, a name I have referred to before. As a rule there were simultaneously two princes so qualified, and not seldom we see their titles mentioned in a pair as *Tso Yu Tu-ch'ü-wang* 左右屠耆王, or *Tso Yu Hsien-wang* 左右賢王, Right and Left Wise-king, in Chinese chronicles. Then we hear of Hun-hsieh Wang 渾邪王 and Hsiu-ch'ü Wang 休屠王, two Hiung-nu feudal lords who occupied at the time of Wu-ti the western part of what is now Kan-su Province 甘肅.<sup>2)</sup> In China,

1) Chap. 94 a, p. 7v: 天所立匈奴大單于; p. 8v, 9r: 天地所生, 日月所置, 匈奴大單于.

2) Another case of the conferment of *wang* is shown in the *Hiung-nu Chuan* in *Shih-chi* (chap. 110, p. 11r) in the paragraph relating to I-chih-hsieh Shan-yü 伊稚斜單于, as: "The Han general Chao Hsien 趙信, lord of Hsi 翕侯, lost his battle, and surrendered himself to the Hiung-nu. Originally he was a Hiung-nu petty wang, but deserting and going over to the Han, he was appointed Lord of Hsi. Now the *Shan-yü* won him back and made him Tzu-tz'u Wang 自次王, 前將軍翕侯趙信兵不利降匈奴, 趙信者故胡小王降漢, 漢封爲翕侯.....單于既得

the same title *wang* had been the highest mark of sovereignty up to the end of the Contending State epoch, when Shih-huang's adoption of *huang-ti* deprived it of its original importance, so much so that in the subsequent Han dynasty it became proper to mere feudal lords. Thus we see the Hiung-nu title of *wang* was evenly balanced with the Chinese *wang*, and considered relatively, we may fairly estimate what equality was claimed for *shan-yü* as compared with the Chinese supreme title.

As a matter of course the nature of the title *shan-yü* did not allow of anything like the co-existence of more than one master bearing it. When the Hiung-nu, however, were tempted by the plot of a Han emperor against them to split into the northern and southern states, there came to be two Hiung-nu *Shan-yü*. This was the beginning of the depreciation of the title. Henceforward the race itself continued to decline until at last we see it completely eclipsed by the rise of the Hsien-pei people 鮮卑. When the chief of this new power T'an-shih-huai 檀石槐 held supremacy over the whole desert north, what title he adopted for himself is not to be traced in history. Immediately after his death, his domain was dissolved and fell into division among many minor chieftains, some calling themselves *wang* and others *shan-yü*. This state of things may be well illustrated by the following extract from the *Wu-hwan Chuan* 烏丸傳 in the *Wei-chi* 魏志:—

"About the close of the Han dynasty, Ch'iu-li-chü 丘力居, chief of the Wu-hwan tribe west of the Liao-ho, had more than 5,000 groups of people, and Nan-lou 難樓 in Shang-ku 上谷 over 9,000, each calling himself *wang*. Su-p'u-yuen 蘇僕延, the Wu-hwan chief of the Liao-tung Province District, who commanded more than 1,000 groups called himself Ch'iao Wang 峭王, while Wu-yuen 烏延, the Wu-hwan chief of more than 8,000 groups in Yu-pei-p'ing 右北平, called himself Han-lu Wang 汗魯王. ... When Ch'iu-li-chü died, his son Lou-pan 樓班 was very young, but his nephew T'a-tun 蹋頓, being a man of great military tact, acted as regent, making himself commander of the three kingdoms, which were all glad to obey him. Seeing that in China then Yuan-shao 袁紹 was at war with Kung-sun Tsan 公孫瓚, repeating indecisive battles between them, T'a-tun offered an alliance with Yuan-shao, for whom he attacked and defeated Kung-sun Tsan. This made Yuan-shao modify the imperial order so as to confer on T'a-tun the seals and insignia of Nan Wang, of Ch'iao

---

翁侯以爲自次王 "Tzu-tz'u" is interpreted by the *Shih-chi-cheng-i* 史記正義 as "the most important next to *Shan-yü*" 尊重次於單于. Still another instance of *wang* appears in the same history (chap. 110, p. 10r) where it relates how the captain of the Yen-men garrison 雁門 betrayed Han, by informing Chün-ch'en Shan-yü 軍臣單于 of Wen-ti's stratagem of laying an ambush at Ma-i 馬邑 to capture him. The *Shan-yü* was so deeply gratified that he exclaimed, "Heaven sent the captain to tell me. He shall be made *T'ien Wang* 天王, Heaven King." 天使若言, 以尉史爲天王.

Wang and of Han-lu Wang together, making him *shan-yü* over all those kingdoms."<sup>1)</sup>

From the above paragraph we may gather how, by the end of the later Han period, *shan-yü* had become a sort of badge to be bestowed on the barbarian chiefs at the pleasure of the Chinese sovereign, and how little it surpassed in value *wang* as then used. That such was also the case from the Three Kingdom Age to the Chin dynasty 晉 can be proved by abundant evidence. The first of the two most conspicuous instances I am going to cite is found in the biography of Liu Yuan-hai 劉元海 in the *Tsai-chi* 載記 in the *Chin-shu* 晉書. He was grandson of Ch'ian-ch'ü Shan-yü 羌渠單于, who, being a descendant of Mau-tun Shan-yü, was master of the Hiung-nu during the era of *Chung-p'ing* 中平 of the later Han dynasty. Seeing the maladministration of the Chin emperor Hui-ti throwing the country into the imminent danger of revolution, the Hiung-nu desired to take this opportunity to restore themselves to their old power, and as a result Yuan-hai was elected in secret to be Great *Shan-yü*. But what was the real value attached to this home title may be estimated from the subsequent fact that this Great *Shan-yü* of the Hiung-nu was willing to be entitled as Northern *Shan-yü* by Ying 顯, Wang of Ch'eng-tu 成都, and become a member of that king's war-council. What is more significant, this person who was already at once Great *Shan-yü* and Northern *Shan-yü* accepted a Chinese appointment as Han Wang 漢王, in the first year of *Yung-hing* 永興 (304 A.D.) such a thing would have been impossible if *Shan-yü* as the native title had been esteemed half as important as of old. Ultimately Yuan-hai took the title of *huang-ti*, perhaps the only name thought worthy of the height he had attained by that time. Then my second evidence is derived from the life of Huo-lien P'o-p'o 赫連勃勃 also contained in the *Tsai-chi* in the *Chin-shu*. In the 3rd year of *I-shi* (407 A.D.), he proclaimed himself *T'ien-wang Ta Shan-yü* 天王大單于, but when he had captured the Chinese capital Chang-an 長安 and won for himself greater supremacy, his subjects desired he should be enthroned as *Huang-ti*, which was done.

Such was the extent to which the grand title *shan-yü*, once emulating even *huang-ti* in dignity and importance, had lost its significance, becoming subordinate and inferior to *huang-ti*, and no higher than *wang* or lord. But why, we may ask, did not some fresh title spring from among the northern races, to replace the decadent and dabased one, to claim again equality with *huang-ti*? Perhaps to glance over the general condition in the north

---

1) Chap. 30: 漢末遼西烏丸大人丘力居衆五千餘落，上谷難樓九千餘落，各稱王，而遼東屬國烏丸大人蘇僕延衆千餘落，自稱峭王，右北平烏丸大人烏延衆八百餘落，自稱汗魯王，……丘力居死，樓班年小，從子蹋頓有武略，代之總攝三王部衆，皆從其教令，袁紹與公孫瓚連戰不決，蹋頓遣使，詣紹求和親，助紹擊瓚破之，紹矯制，賜蹋頓難峭王汗魯王印綬，皆以爲單于。

from the second half of the Later Han to the end of the Chin dynasty will best answer this question.

As we have already seen, the fall of the Hiung-nu power was accelerated by the conquest of the Hsien-pei chief T'an-shih-huai, who held only for a short spell mastery over the north regions. His death was followed by the rapid dissolution of the rule, and for some time on there appeared no dominating power in that quarter. Meanwhile the corrupt administration of the Western Chin dynasty in China afforded chances for the encroaching frontagers to swarm in from the north and west, to occupy the valley of the Yellow River, where they developed during the next century and a quarter the "Sixteen States of the Five Barbarian Races," the rise and fall, division and annexation of which fill up that particular epoch of Chinese history. While those aliens had remained outside, no chiefs among them were so predominately superior but that they were satisfied with *wang* or *kung* or *shan-yü*, or anything that might be granted them by the Chinese court. Nor was there any inducement for seeking a higher native title. Again after those frontagers had come in and established regular states in China, their monarchs might be glad to call themselves *wang*, or if possible, *huang-ti*, but never *shan-yü* or great *shan-yü* or any other name of native origin; so completely assimilated to Chinese civilization were they by that time. In a word, there was in those periods no occasion to call forth among the barbarians any native title with new import. Then, at the close of the Eastern Chin dynasty, the T'o-po tribe 拓跋氏 of the Hsien-pei stock rose to power south of the Yin Shan. They invaded the north of Shan-hsi Province 山西, subdued Mu-yung 慕容 on the east and Yao 姚氏 on the west, and annexing all the land about the Yellow River, finally established there a powerful monarchy. They named their country Wei 魏, and made Lo-yang 洛陽 its capital. But by that time they had been so well blended with the Chinese that their racial traits were hardly discernible. So in this case also there was no chance for a northern title to come into existence.

About the same period, however, there appeared in the north another power, which succeeded at last in unifying all the outlying regions. This was the Juan-juan tribe 蠕蠕, kindred to the T'o-po just mentioned. At the end of the Eastern Chin period, her dominion extended from Liao-tung on the east to the T'ien Shan Mountains on the west, verging on the Baikal on the north and lining up to the Great Wall on the south. Such vastness of territory, such great population had never been attained in that quarter since the days of the Hiung-nu supremacy. In her position relative to China, she also recalled the old Hiung-nu; for she posed herself against the Wei monarchy beyond the Wall no less proudly than Mau-tun and his sons once did against Han. So in every way she was the most formidable power the barbaric regions had produced since the Later Han epoch. Why should she

rest content with the old worn-out title *Shan-yü*, whose original signification had been lost sight of? Far from that, there must have been even an ardent desire for a symbol glorious enough to match the Chinese *Huang-ti*, and this must have resulted in the establishment of the new sovereign title *kaghan*. It was very natural that this historic name did not originate among the Hsien-pei race keeping at the head of the Liao-ho, nor among the Tu-yü-hun or the Ch'i-fu holding the upper Yellow River, but among the Juan-juan tribe which dominated the whole north region. This conclusion, I hope, will corroborate and go to reflect appreciation on that judicious though brief comment of T'u-yu's that the title *kaghan* dated from Ch'iu-tou-fa K'o-han of the Juan-juan tribe.

### III

#### *Kaghan* a Mongol Term.

The Hsien-pei race was, as I have once observed in a study on the Hiung-nu, a mixed composition which was predominately Mongol, but more or less tempered with the Tunguse element. Seeing that the Juan-juan tribe was part of the Hsien-pei race, then, it is a most natural inference that the title *kaghan* which originated with them was a Mongol or Tunguse word. We have already seen that those peoples which were the earliest users of the title in history all proved to be of Hsien-pei origin. Still another fact deserving attention is that there are certain words used by them in connection with the title which are recognizable as Mongol or Tunguse.

As we have remarked before, the chief of the Hsien-pei Tu-yü-hun is represented in the *Sung-shu* as having been addressed with the words "ch'u k'o-han" 處可寒, which are interpreted as equivalent to "erh Kuan-chia" (爾官家, Yes, emperor), in the Chinese language. Apart from this, we find in the *Juan-juan Chuan* included in the *Pei-shu* and the *Wei-shu* a Juan-juan chief whose personal name and title was Ch'u K'o-han 處可汗. The author remarks that its equivalent in Chinese is Wei K'o-han 唯可汗, the initial character being a word meaning "yes." It is a known fact that the affirmative word in Mongol and Tunguse was "že,"<sup>1)</sup> and beyond all doubt the Hsien-pei original in the one case above, and the Juan-juan in the other, of what is transcribed as 處 *ch'u* was this Mongol term "že."

We have also a proof to show that "že" was the Mongol affirmative in the age of Chingis Khan as well. The *Jingisu-Kan Jitsu-roku* (成吉思汗

---

1) *Tsing-wen-i-shu*, 清文彙書 Vol. 9.



實錄, The Life of Chingis Khan), reporting a conversation between Budanchar 孛端察兒 and his elder brother Bugu 牙塔吉 不忽合塔吉, says: “*Tendeče aya inu ügüleriin: že,*” (Then his elder brother says: Yes, certainly). The term *že* in the original text is represented by the character 者 *chê* in the *Yüan-chao-pi-shi* 元朝秘史, which is the Chinese transcription of the book, while NAKA, annotating this document, read the character 者 *že*, and translated it into *ube* 諾, which is an archaic Japanese for “yes,” suggesting in the appended note that it might as properly be interpreted “as” 唯 “ay,” 善 “good,” or 然 “yes.”

Then, another noticeable word in history which can be traced to the Mongol tongue is the tribal name Ch'i-fu 乞伏, which we have above observed was derived from the Mongol word for “child,” *köbü* or *köbiin*. That the tribe bearing that name was of the Hsien-pei stock is clear from the statement in the *Tsai-chi* in the *Chin-shu* asserting that Ch'i-fu Kuo-jên 乞伏國仁 was a Hsien-pei man hailing from Lung-hsi 隴西. It may be also noted that the *Ch'i-fu-shis Chuan*, with the *Tu-yü-hun Chuan* and the *Juan-juan Chuan*, make the oldest documents in which *kaghan* is discoverable. Thus all the ancient tribes whose histories bear evidence of the title are identified with the Hsien-pei race, and after it has been demonstrated that the race was for the most part of Mongolian descent, the claim will be sufficiently justifiable that *kaghan* was a Mongol term.

The positive reason above set forth that *kaghan* was not a Turkish but a Mongol word may be accompanied by a negative one, which comes from the total absence of indication in literature that any Turkish chief had been called by that title before the Juan-juan leader adopted it for himself. We may begin with the Wu-sun people, 烏孫 who were presumably the oldest Turks to receive mention in Chinese annals, and whose home during the Han period was located at the northern foot of the T'ien-shan Mountains. Their ruler was styled, as I have once remarked in my “Study on the Wu-sun people” 烏孫考, *Kun-bak* 昆莫 or So and So *Bi* 靡. The one is recognizable as the transcription from the Turkish *kun bäg* or *kun bái* (great lord), and the other from the Turkish form peculiar to the sovereign, So and So *Bái* or *Bi*. What is transcribed as above may also be compared to the word *bi* which is still to be heard among the Kara Kirghiz in the T'ien-shan and among the Kasak Kirghiz in the Kirghiz plains when they speak of a chieftain.

The Wu-sun tribe, alike with the other issue of the Turkish race the Ta-yüeh-chi 大月氏, was forced far away to the west by the Hsiung-nu ascendancy during the Han dynasty, and from that time long ages had elapsed before any people to be properly called Turkish could establish any considerable power on the north side of the Wall. During this interval, nothing is to be known as to what titles were used by the Turks. Coming

down to the Southern and Northern Dynasties, however, we see that Turkish tribe called Kao-ch'ê 高車, which had abided in the valley of the Selenga to the south of Baikal, rise into eminence. As a result, their history finds a place in the *Pei-shi* as the *Kao-ch'ê Chuan* 高車傳, with the indication of their native titles as follows: In the 11th year of *Tai-ho* 大和, Tou-lun 豆鞞 attacked the Chinese border. This action had been strongly remonstrated against by A-fu-chih-lo 阿伏至羅, whose words were, however, ignored. Out of indignation, he departed westward in revolt, and reaching with his horde the district north-west of Ch'ien-pu 前部, declared himself *wang*. His subjects called him *Hou-lu P'ü-lê* (*Hu-lu puk-luk*) 候婁匍勒, which was equal to *Ta-t'ien-tzu* 大天子, great emperor. Then Ch'üung-ch'ü 窮奇 was styled *Hou-pei* (*Hu-bai*) 候倍, which corresponded to the Chinese *ch'u-chu* 儲主, the royal heir.<sup>1)</sup>

G. SCHLEGEL thought the above title *hu-lu puk-luk* was traceable to the Turkish *ulug bäglik* or *ulu bäglik*, pointing out at the same time that its original significance was exactly the same as "grosse Herrschaft" (great Majesty),<sup>2)</sup> though for practical purposes it might be interpreted as "great sovereign," as proposed by the *Pei-shi*. On the other title above mentioned, *hu-bai* 候倍, our western scholar provides no comment, but in my opinion it also may be attributed to Turkish origin. We know that the equivalent for "child" is *au* or *ul* in the Baškir tongue, of the Turkish group, is *ul* in Tobolsk, and *uu* or *oul* in Jakut. It is very probable that the initial character 候 *hu* was transcribed from *uu* or *au* just mentioned. Then the second character in the title 倍 *bai* strongly suggests the Turkish *bai* or *bei*, which signifies "chief." So the whole term *hu-bai* 候倍 was presumably the transcription of *u-bai* or something like that, which must have denoted "child lord" or "prince."

We have already noticed that the word *bai* or *bi* was a title used by the Wu-sun for their chieftain, and here is evidence that it was also used by the Kirghiz 黠戛斯 who inhabited the upper course of the Yenisei, in the following passage from the *Hsia-chia-ssü Chuan* 黠戛斯傳 in the *T'ang-shu* 唐書: "There were three chieftains whose names were Ch'ü-hsi pei 訖悉輩, Ku-sha-po pei 居沙波輩, and A-mi pei 阿米輩, who governed the country together."<sup>3)</sup> Beyond doubt the character 輩 (*pei* or *pai*) in every case above was not part of the personal name, but an attached title, and so comparable to that Wu-sun form *bai* or *bi* 靡, while at the same time it seems to show much affinity to the final member of that Kao-ch'ê title is represented in Chinese as *hu-bai* 候倍.

1) Chap. 98, p. 19v.

2) Die Chinesische Inschrift auf dem uigurischen Denkmal in Kara Balgassun. 1896, p. XIV.

3) Chap. 217 b, p. 13v.

To return to the above extract from the *K'ao-ch'ê Chuan*, the said era of *T'ai-ho* belonged under Hsia-wên-ti 孝文帝 of Wei, and the 11th year thereof being coincident with 497 A.D., we have it implied in that passage that at 87 years after the Juan-juan adoption of *Kaghan*, the neighbouring tribe Kao-ch'ê were still calling their ruler by *ulug baglik*, which was very similar in signification to the old Wu-sun title *kun-bak* 昆莫. True the title I-li K'o-han 伊利可汗 was assumed by T'umen 土門, the chief of the T'u-chüeh 突厥 tribe descended from the same origin as the Kao-ch'ê, but it was not until 552 or 553 A.D., in other words 66 or 67 years later than that date at which the Kao-ch'ê title was distinguishable. These observations afford further assurances that *kaghan* was a Mongol term, first established as the royal title by the Juan-juan tribe of Mongolian origin.

#### IV

### *Khan and Kaghan*

#### Compared in Formation and Use.

As has been noticed in several quotations given so far, the title *kaghan* is transcribed as 可寒 only in the *Hsien-pei Tu-yü-hun Chuan* in the *Sung-shu*, while the *Juan-juan Chuan* in the *Wei-shu*, the *Tu-yü-hun Chuan* in the *Wei-shu* and the *Pei-shu*, and the *Ch'i-fu Kuo-jên Chuan* in the *Chin-shu* all agree in writing it with the characters 可汗. That this transcript was to be pronounced *kayan* may be proved by reference to the old monuments left by the T'u-chüeh people. The same form is seen in regular use with the histories written in the Sui 隋 and T'ang 唐 dynasties. Besides, the monuments of Kül Tegin 闕特勤 and Bilgä Kaghan 苾伽可汗, with T'u-chüeh text, erected in the *Kai-yüan* 開元 era of Hsüan-tsung 玄宗 of T'ang, represent the native master and the T'ang emperor in every case as *kayan*.

However, the inscriptions dedicated to Mo-chi-lien Kaghan 默棘連可汗 under the earlier date of the 9th year of *Ssü-shêng* 嗣聖 (692 A.D.) show the title in the two forms of *kaghan* and *khan*. The text concerned may be rendered: "Our ancestor Jami *Kayan* chased, defeated, scattered, and crushed his foes in four quarters. After the passing away of this *kan*, his people fell, broke up, and fled."<sup>1)</sup> RADLOFF, commenting on this, did not suppose *kan* to be a misscript for what should have been *kayan*, but recognized them as two distinct forms, suggesting at the same time that *kan* might be the proper T'u-chüeh term, while *kayan* was perhaps a variation

1) RADLOFF. Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei. pp. 246-247.

caused by the influence of the Chinese language. Both forms are found side by side again on the T'u-chüen monument of Tonjukuk 墩欲谷, and the same scholar, pointing to the *kan* in the opening passage of the writing on the western side of the stone, surmised that this title was applied to the chieftain of a minor tribe which was not developed enough to make a regular state, and therefore was distinguishable from the other form *kaγan*, which referred to a supreme sovereign.<sup>1)</sup>

Giving careful reading, however, to the inscriptions under discussion, we seem to find nothing to confirm the opinion that the use of *kan* was so restricted to insignificant or subordinate chiefs. In contrast to those monuments above mentioned where appears *kaγan* alone, we may notice the one dedicated to Jenisei. Here the converse is the case, and if we were to take *kan* in that supposed narrower sense, the result would be the total absence of the sovereign title from that inscription. But in fact there is to be detected the phrase "*Tabgaë Kanγa*" (to the *kan* of Tabgaë), which as obviously referred to the T'ang emperor as did "*Tabgaë Kaγanγa*" on the monument of Kül Tegin, so that RADLOFF himself had to translate it "to the Emperor of China." It is clear then that *kan* found in those T'u-chüeh inscriptions is not to be interpreted as a title peculiar to a mere chieftain or minor king.

If the T'u-chüeh, as they occupied the Mongolian regions during the T'ang dynasty, had two forms of the sovereign title, it might be easily expected that their westward movement subsequently transferred both of them to their new spheres of power. And in fact both are present in some Persian and Arabian documents. One figures as *käkän* or *khäkän*, no doubt a corruption of *kaγan*, and the other as *kän* or *khän*, as evidently come from *kan*. Sometimes we see also *kaan* and *khaan*, which in their turn reflect *käkän* and *khäkän*. This duplication was as wide-spread in the Mongol languages, and no wonder it should have led to the supposition that there was some distinction between the two forms as regards signification and use. Perhaps the first scholar to take interest in this discrimination was QUATRE-MÈRE. Pointing to *khan* and *kaän* as two historical titles borne by the Mongol rulers, he suggested that the first one was not peculiar to the Mongol, but also found distributed among other Tartar languages. Since its first adoption by Chinggis Khan, it had been handed down by the succession of subordinate rulers issuing from the royal family, and so continued up to the present time to be assumed by the heads of those tribes inhabiting the northern districts of Asia. The other title *kaän*, the interpreter thought, was adopted by Oktai for himself and for his direct line exclusively, and was never permissible for any other Mongolian ruler. Thus it seemed clear to our observer that *kaän* was a superior title to *khän*.<sup>2)</sup>

1) Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei, zweite Folge, p. 29.

2) L'Histoire des Mongols. pp. 10, 84.

LACOUPERIE was another investigator who believed in such distinction. He thought *khakan* was a term comparable in importance to the Chinese supreme title *huang-ti*. Its etymology he could easily explain: the final part of the word *kan* was formed by *khan*, which was itself a title for chief or lord. The initial member *kha* was traceable to such words as *aku* in Wogul, *oker* in Ostjak, and *yga* in Manchu, all of which meant "first"; or to the Turkish *agha* "lord"; or to the Mongol *ika* "great"; or to the Dravidian *ko* "king". Thus he reached the interpretation of *Khakan* as "great Khan" or "the *khan* of *khans*."<sup>1)</sup>

Nor can we omit to mention YULE, who, commenting on the Mogolian title *kaan* recorded in Marco Polo's Travels, thus expatiates on the distinction between the two forms: "We endeavour to preserve throughout the book the distinction that was made in the age of the Mongol Empire between *Khan* and *Kaan*.....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. *Kaan*, again, appears to be a form of *Khakan*, the *χαγανοζ* of the Byzantine historians, and was the peculiar title of the supreme sovereign of the Mongols; the Mongol princes of Persia, Chagatai, etc., were entitled only to the former affix *Khán*, though *Káán* and *Khakán* are sometimes applied to them in adulation. Polo always writes *Kaan* as applied to the Great *Khan*, and does not, I think, use *Kaan* in any form, styling the subordinate princes by their name only, as *Argón*, *Alan*, etc. ....The relation between *Khán* and *Khakán* 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."<sup>2)</sup>

I suspect the same theory of distinction still prevails among western students when they concern themselves with this subject. RAMSTEDT, for instance, in his recent work "Zwei uigurischen Runeninschriften" interprets *qan* as "lord" and *qayan* as "emperor."<sup>3)</sup>

I also believed that some distinction was made between *kan* and *kayan*, but coming to notice those T'u-chüeh inscriptions which pointed to the contrary, I began to doubt, and after renewed study of the two forms having regard to the age of the Mongol empire, I have reached the conclusion it is impossible to recognize that any distinction was made between them.

The first document to be examined was the *Yüan-chao-pi-shi* 元朝秘史,

---

1) Khan, khakan and other Tartar titles. *The Babylonian and Oriental Record*. Vol. II., pp.269-274. Vol. III., pp. 19-22.

2) Marco Polo. vol. I. p. 10.

3) Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, XXX. p. 6.

the history of the Yüan dynasty written in the Mongol language in the Chinese script and accompanied with the Chinese version. I went through the book, comparing *kan* and *kaghan* as recorded there, and found that it made no distinction between them. What appears in this history as 合罕 is evidently the transcript of *kayan*, and the Ming version of it is *huang-ti* 皇帝. In Chapter III, however, we find the name of a Mongol sovereign given as 王罕 *Wang han*, of which *han* is very obviously *kan*, and this is also rendered as *huang-ti*. We see this same person mentioned in Chapter V as *Wang kayan* 王合罕, of which the title *kayan* is of course rendered *huang-ti*. Similar indiscriminate application of both forms is also witnessed between *habul kayan* (Kabul Kaghan) 合不勒合罕 in Chapter I and *habul han-u* 合不勒合罕訥, "of Kabul Kan" in Chapter IV; also between Ögödei *han* 斡歌歹罕 in Supplement Chapter I and Ögödei *kayan* 斡歌歹合罕 in Supplementary Chapter II. Of the rendering of *han* 罕 as *huang-ti*, 皇帝 further example are: *han* echige 罕額赤格 against Huang-ti 皇帝父親; *Toyoril han* 脫斡鄰勒罕 against *Toyoril Huang-ti* 脫斡鄰勒皇帝; *hutula han-u kuyun* 忽秃利合訥可溫 against Son of *hutula Huang-ti* 忽秃利皇帝的兒子; in Chapter V, *Yesügei han* 也速該罕 against *Yesügei Huang-ti* 也速該皇帝; in Chapter VII, *T'ayang han* 塔陽罕 against *T'ayang Huang-ti*, *Torluk han* 脫兒魯黑罕 against *Torluk Huang-ti*, *Kücülük han* 古出魯克汗 against *Kücülük Huang-ti*; in Supplementary Chapter I, *Altan han* 阿勒壇汗 against *Altan Huang-ti*, etc.

Most significant is this passage in Chapter III: "Temüzin was called Chinggis *kayan* 成吉思合罕 and made *han* 罕 (*Temüzin-i Chinggis kayan keyen nereitü han bolgaba*), which is followed by Chinggis *kayan* 成吉思合罕 becoming *han* 罕 (*Chinggis kayan han bolžu*)." This would make a most unaccountable statement under the presupposition that *han* and *kayan* meant different things.

Further evidences are discovered in certain proclamations left by Mongol sovereigns and princes. The injunctions of An-hsi Wang 安西王 issued in the 13th year of *Chi-yüan* 至元 of Shih-tsu 世祖 of the Yüan dynasty (1276 A.D.) being bilingual, the Chinese passage "皇帝福蔭裏成吉思皇帝 匣罕皇帝聖旨裏" (By the grace of the Emperor, by the pleasure of Chinggis Emperor, *kayan* Emperor) is paralleled to the Mongol "*kayan-u ba sul-dur Chinggis han-u kayan-u ba žarlik-dur*." It is obvious the characters 匣罕 stood for *kayan*, as suggested by Chavannes. The most important thing to observe is that where the Mongol text shows *han* after "Chinggis," and next *kayan*, the Chinese repeats 皇帝 *huang-ti* both in "成吉思皇帝" Chinggis Emperor and in "匣罕皇帝" *kayan* Emperor.

Again the Mongol imperial edict issued in the 1st year of *Yen-yü* 延祐 of Jen-tsung 仁宗 (1314 A.D.) and preserved at Ho-nan Fu 河南府 and Chang-té Fu 彰德府, has a passage which runs in Chinese: "皇帝聖旨成

吉思皇帝月克臺皇帝薛禪皇帝完者都皇帝曲律皇帝，” and in Mongol: “*χayan-u žarlık manu Chinggis χan, Oködei χayan, Sečen χayan, Olžeiüi χayan, Küüg χayan.*” Here we see “Chinggis” is once more followed by *χan*, while all the other names have *χayan* after them. On the face of this example, it might seem the application of the two forms was discriminated. But if we turn to examine the edict of Buyantu *χayan* found at Chang-té Fu, we shall see Chinggis represented, not as “Chinggis *χan*,” but “Chinggis *χayan*.”

The indiscriminate use of *kan* and *χayan* is also conspicuous in the *Yüan-shi* 元史. Not unfrequently the same sovereign is styled both ways, for example: *χabul χan* 葛不律寒 and *χabul χayan* 合不勒合罕 in the *T'ai-tsu-chi* 太祖紀 in Chapter I; Wang *χan* 王罕 in the same Chapter and Wang *χayan* 王可汗 in the *Mu-xa-li Chuan* 木華黎傳 and the *Pu-lu-mu Chuan* 不忽木傳 in Chapter XIX; *gur-χan* 局兒罕 in the *T'ai-tsu-chi* in Chapter I, (Gur) *χayan* 鞠兒可汗 in the *Ha-la-i-pe-lu Chuan* 哈利亦北魯傳 in Chapter XXIV, and Kur *χayan* 居里可汗 in the *Pu-lu-hai-ya Chuan* 布魯海牙傳 in Chapter CXXV; Ambai *χan* 咸補海罕 and Ambarai *χayan* 俺巴孫合罕 in the same *T'ai-tsu-chi*; Tajang *χan* 太陽罕 in Chapter I and Tajang *χayan* 太陽可汗 in the *A-la-wu-ste lu-li Chuan* 阿剌兀思剔忽王傳 in Chapter CXVIII, etc.

There are still more facts which contradict the idea that *khan* applied to lords and subordinate kings while *kaghan* was reserved for the supreme sovereign. According to such theory, the master of Ilkhan, for instance, who ruled Persia, or the chief of Kipčak who dominated Russia must have been called only *χan* (*gan* or *kan*). But the fact shows to the contrary. In a message addressed to Philip IV of France, the Ilkhan monarch Öljeitüi styled himself *kaghan*. And it is a matter of natural expectation that the head of Kipčak-khan, a country on equal status with Ilkhan, should assume the same title. In fact, the coin issued by the Kipčak ruler Zani Beg about 1342-3 A. D. bears the legend at the centre “Zani Beg Kan,” but along the edge “(Rightful) *Kagan zelal ed-din Mahmud Sultan.*”

Furthermore the examination of several books of glossary seems to yield the same result. The *Wei-wu-er-kuan-i-yu* (畏兀兒館譯語, Uigur Glossary) included in KLAPROTH'S Study of the Uigur language and script compares *khan* to *wang*, and *kaghan* to *huang-ti*, but a copy of the same glossary I have available makes *χan* 罕 correspond to *huang-ti*, there being no *χayan*. The *Pei-lu-i-yu* (北虜譯語, Northern Barbaric Glossary) gives *χa-an* 哈案 against *huang-ti*, and the *Ta-tan-i-yu* (韃靼譯語, Tartar Glossary) differs only in transcribing *χa-an* as 哈案 instead of 哈案. In Manchu speech, the equivalent of *huang-ti* appears as *han* 汗, the word *kagan* not being discoverable, while the *Mung-ku-yuan-liu* (蒙古源流, Mongolian Resources) shows *kagan*, but not *kan*.

The theory for acknowledging distinction between *χan* or *khan* and *χayan*

or *kaghan* being dismissed as untenable, the next question is whether one was transformed from the other. This is a subject which began to be discussed as early as 1872 by W. SCHOTT, who thought that the Mongol language had a habit of dropping the sound *gh* between vowels, and this must be how *kaghan* came to be *kan*.<sup>1)</sup> Radloff went further to explain the process of transformation to the following effect: The Mongol language has certain long sounds like *a, ä, o, ö, u, ü, i*, which appear in script as *agu, üge, ugu, ügü, ige*, etc., and consequently in the Turkish group, one finds three different forms of *Kaghan*, as *qaan* in the Altai dialect, *qân* in the Abakan, and *qan* in the Kirgiz. The Altai form being *qaan*, it was only natural the same word will appear as *qaan* in the Arabian and Persian documents. The author then calls attention to KOWALEWSKI'S Mongol dictionary, where *Khan* and *Kaghan* are interpreted indiscriminately as "roi," "princes" and "monarque." His conclusion is that these two words, so far as script goes, has passed two stages of development; first they meant the same thing, but later came a differentiation of value between them.<sup>2)</sup> Next comes BLOCHET, whose theory may be outlined as follows: In the Arabian and Persian documents, one meets with *qaqan, qâqân, qâan, qâân, qân* and *qân*. Of these forms, *qâqân* and *qâqân* are evidently derived from *qagan*. Since in the Mongol and Turkish languages the sound of *k* often disappears between vowels, the *qâân* found in the Arabian writings must be regarded as a contraction of *qâqân*, and as presumably *qâân* was in its turn shortened to *qân*. By the same process *qâqân* contracted into *qâân*, and this again into *qân*.<sup>3)</sup>

The derivation of *qân* from *qagan* seems quite acceptable to me, but by way of confirming the foregoing opinions, I may draw further materials from the records belonging to the Yüan dynasty. The *Yüan-chao-pi-shi*, in Chapter I shows the Mongol title 合罕, which is no doubt to be read *qagan* (*qagan*). In Chapter V, however, we see 合阿訥 *qaan-u*, i. e. *qaan's*, and 成吉思合阿訥 Chinggis *qaan-a*, i. e. to Chinggis *qaan*. From these examples it might be suspected that in that period the title was pronounced both ways as *qagan* and *qaan*, but I believe it more probable that the actual pronunciation was not exactly the one or the other.

This thought is advanced by noticing the representation of the title as 𐰽𐰺𐰏 in the Pa-ssu-pa script 巴思八文字, the mongol system of writing which dated from the reign of the Shih-tsu of the Yüan dynasty. PAUTHIER applying to the second character the sound of *kha*, pronounced the term *kakhan*.<sup>4)</sup> POZDNIIEFF, on the other hand, thought the character was equal to " ," which would make the title read *q'an*. Either speculation I hesitate

1) Altaische Studien pp. 3-4.

2) Phonetik der nördliche Türksprachen. pp. 76-77.

3) Les Inscriptions turques de l'Orkhon. pp. 29-31, note 3.

4) Le Livre de Marco Polo. Appendice, No. 4. p. 773.



to support. It is known that the Pa-ssü-pa character 𐰢 was modelled after the Tibetan ࠨ, which showed an exceedingly weak sound, which was perhaps even weaker than *h*. There is every reason to believe 𐰢 denoted a sound which may be located between *gh* and the aspiration preceding the vowel *a*. For transcribing this peculiar sound, the Chinese scribes had, for want of better means, to employ approximate substitutes such as 阿 (*a*) in the *Shu-shih-hui-yao* 書史會要, Chapter I, which was, strictly speaking, rather too weak for the original.

The same difficulty in transcribing the Mongol sound 𐰢, was met in the Uigur language by means of 𐰣 and 𐰤, whose proper sounds were respectively *kh* ( $\chi$ ) and *gh* ( $\gamma$ ). Thus in the message to Philip IV of France by the Ilkhan monarch Argun in 1289 (the 26th year of *Chih-yüan* under Shih-tsu of Yüan), the Mongol title appears in the Uigur equivalent of *χayan*, of which  $\gamma$  must certainly have been too strong for the sound intended. We may also notice how the same literary work, comparing in Chapter III the Uigur and Pa-ssü-pa scripts, set 𐰣 ( $\chi$ ) and 𐰤 ( $\gamma$ ) over against 𐰢 ( $\chi$ ) and 𐰢. The Uigur character 𐰣 sounded as  $\chi$  and 𐰤 as  $\gamma$ , and it was quite appropriate to compare them with 𐰢, whose sound was  $\chi$ , but their comparison with 𐰢 was less justifiable.

After all, the difficulties observed above will only serve to emphasize the peculiarity of that Mongol weak guttural the only proper indication of which was the character 𐰢. Marco Polo's Travels recorded the Mongolian sovereign title as *qaan*, and in this case the letter *a* was apparently adopted as the best substitute available in the Roman alphabet for representing the same delicate guttural. The Chinese transcript 哈案 (*χa-an*), as mentioned above, was an analogous case, and still another will be seen in the coin of Batu Khan of Kipchak, which bears "*qaan*" in Arabian script.

After these observations it seems fairly clear that the Mongol imperial title under discussion, which was 𐰢𐰢𐰣 in the native script, was actually pronounced *χayan*, and neither *kayan* nor *qaan*; decidedly a dissyllable, not the monosyllabic *k'an*, as POZDNEFF suggested. In the history *Yüan-chao-pi-shi*, we see the title 合罕 (*χayan*) varied not only as 罕 (*χan*), but sometimes also as 合 (*χa*). At first sight one might suspect the last was a defective transcript, caused by the careless omission of the character 罕 which should have followed it. But in reality the same form is so frequently repeated that we must needs think otherwise. For example, we read in Chapter III "*Mongol χa 合 ügegün ker aχun ta?*" (How could the Mongols live on without the emperor, ye people?) In Chapter IV, we find "*žamuχa yi χa ergüje*" (Let *Zamuχa* be sovereign over us), and below again "*žamuχa-yi tende gür-χa 古兒合 ergübe*" (*Zamuχa* was made general sovereign over them), and further on again "*žamuχa öjrijen χa 合 ergükset irgen-i toguliġat*" (*Zamuχa* ravaging the people he governed). It seems very

improbable that 合 ( $\chi a$ ) was a mistake for what should have been 合罕 ( $\chi a\chi an$ ) or 合惕 ( $\chi at$ ). What is worth consideration is that in the Mongol and Manchu languages, the *n*-ending is often dropped inorganically. Thus in Mongol, "moon" may be either *sava* or *saran*; and in Manchu, "seven," either *nada* or *nadan*. Most likely by the same process  $\chi an$  was shortened to  $\chi a$ .

So far as the Mongol and Turkish languages are concerned, the evidence of  $\chi a$  as a variation of the title *kaghan* is discoverable only in the particular history just quoted, but there are other materials from which we may draw the inference that the Kh'itan 契丹 people occupying the eastern part of the Mongol land also used this abridged form. The *Kh'i-tan-kuo-chih* 契丹國志 relating the traditional history of the tribe, says: "Later there was one master, who was called Nai-ha 廼呵 .....Then another master, called Hwai-ha 喝呵 .....Then still another, who was called Chou-li-hun-ha 晝里昏呵." Presumably the final character 呵 ( $qa$ ), found common to all the names, was an attached title of honour, and if so, it becomes comparable with that  $\chi a$  合 we have just observed in the Yüan history. Considering that the Kh'itan people were originally descended from the Tung-hu and so kindred with the old Hsien-pei race, it seems sufficiently reasonable to identify their *ha* with the Mongol  $\chi a$ .

## V

### *Kaghan* and the Titles in Ancient Korea.

After we have acknowledged that the Kh'itan people who sprang from the valley of the Shara-müren, the head stream of the Liao, called their ruler *qa* 呵, by a term to be identified with  $\chi a$  合, which was a contraction of  $\chi an$  罕, it is not strange to find a similar title among their contiguous neighbours Fu-yüs 扶餘 and also the Kao-chü-lis 高句麗, the latter's southern issue. Regarding the state of Fu-yü, the *Tung-i Chuan* 東夷傳 in the *Hou-han-shu* 後漢書 says: "The government officials were named after six beasts, as, horse *kia* 馬加, ox *kia* 牛加, boar *kia* 猪加, dog *kia* 狗加, etc. All the villages were governed by those *kia*."<sup>1)</sup> Again the history of the same country included in the *Wei-chih* 魏志 reads in part: "Those ministers under the sovereign bore the names of six beasts as their titles, such as horse *kia*, ox *kia*, boar *kia*, dog *kia*, etc., while there were also such other officials as *ch'üan-shih* 犬使, *tai shih-chê* 大使者, and *shih-chê* 使者. The villages belonging to them had each certain superior families and the lower classes all

1) Chap. 85, p. 2v.

reduced to slaves. These *kia* commanded severally the main roads running out in the four directions 四出道, the greater of them governing thousands, and the smaller, hundreds, of houses.”<sup>1)</sup> From the above quotations it is evident *kia* was a title applied to dignitaries in that country.

The same title was also used by the kindred race Kao-chü-li, as shown by the following passage in the *Kao-chü-li Chuan* 高句麗傳 of the *Wei-chih*: “The ministry was organized in such a manner that if there was the *tui-lu* 對盧, no *p’ei-chê* 沛者 was nominated, while if there was the *p’ei-chê* no *tui-lu* was appointed. The most important relations of the king were allowed to call themselves *ku-tsou-chia* (*ku-tsou-kia*) 古鄒加. The Chuan-nu 涓奴 family, the former rulers of the country, though no longer reigning, were privileged to use the title of *ku-tsou-kia* for the legitimate master of the house. They could also erect the ancestral shrine and observe ceremonies for the worship of sacred stars and gods of plenty. The Chueh-nu 絕奴, who had inter-married with the royal house for generations, were also for that reason granted the title of *ku-tsou-kia*. All the important *kia* had officials of their own, such as *shih-chê* 使者 *tsao-i* 皂衣, and *hsien-jên* 先人, whose appointments were each and all to be reported to the king, in the same manner as (in old China) lords and ministers were expected to announce their own servants.”<sup>2)</sup> The title of *kia*, then, was applied to lords and princes in the country of Kao-chü-li.

This will lead to the question as to what was the Korean title for the king himself. The above-quoted histories give no clue, but some information comes from the *Pai-chi Chuan* 百濟傳 of the *Chou-shu* 周書 as follows: “The king whose family name was Fu-yü 夫餘 assumed the title of *Yu-lo-hsia* (*o-la-kia*) 於羅瑕, while the people called him *Chien-ki-chü* (*kien-ki-chü*) 健吉支, both of which titles meant “*wang*” (王, king) in Chinese.”<sup>3)</sup> It is a fact already recognized that the ruling class in Pai-chi 百濟 consisted in the Fu-yü race, who governed the natives of Han 韓 descent, therefore the above text will mean that in that country the governing circle called the king *o-la-kia*, by a term of their mother tongue, while the native subjects called him *kien-ki-chü* in their own vernacular. The last character 瑕 (*kia*) of that title of the Fu-yü origin, 於羅瑕 (*o-la-kia*), seems to compare with 加 (*kia*), the title which has been just observed with regard to the Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li peoples. As for the first two characters 於羅 (*o-la*), there is reason to believe they were merely a term of respect. The Korean language has the word *orun*, which means “elder,” and this seems to go far to indicate the origin of *o-la*. In the Japanese old history *Nihon-shoki* 日本書紀,

1) Chap. 30. p. 7r.

2) Chap. 30. p. 8v.

3) Chap. 49. p. 3r.

it may be noted in passing, we find a king of Kao-li called *oriko* オリコケ, of which the first half "ori" sounds very much like *o-la*, and though there seems to be a considerable discrepancy between "koke" and *kia* of *o-la-kia*, it was possibly due to a misspelling on the part of the Japanese scribe.

In the examination of the other royal title of Pai-chi which is written as 韃吉支, the first thing to do is to ascertain the pronunciation assigned to each of those characters. The first character 韃 sounds *ken* in Japanese, *kön* in Korean, and *kien* in Annamese. In old China, that it had the sounds of *kan* and *gan* may be inferred from its presence in the transcript of the Sanscrit word *kanyâ*, and from the character of the same sound value, 韃, used in copying another Sanscrit term *Gandhara*. As for the second character 吉, there can be no doubt it was sounded *ki*. To take up the last character, 支 it sounds *shi* in Japan, *chi* in Korea and Annam, while old China leaves materials to show that it sounded there either *chi* or *ki*. From the Chin 晉 period to the Northern and Southern dynasties, we often witness on record the characters 月支 substituted for 月氏 (Yueh-chi), as the Han chroniclers wrote that tribal name. That the same character also sounded *ki* in those periods may be known from the fact that the *Wei-chih*, in the history of Japan included in it, gave the Japanese province Iki 壹岐 as 一支.

All that can be gathered from the above observations is that the title 韃吉支 was pronounced either *ken-ki-chi*, or *ken-ki-ki*, or *kan-ki-ki*, or *kan-ki-chi*, but there are some evidences which assist us to choose between these alternatives. In the *Nihon-shoki* we find a king of Mimana (Jen-na 任那) mentioned as *Han-chi* (χan-k'i) 旱岐, and in the *Sin-lo Chuan* 新羅傳 of the *Liang-shu* 梁書, certain Korean dignitaries are given as So and Sô *Han-ki* (χan-k'i) 旱支, while So and So *Kan-kuei* 干貴 recorded in the *Sin-lo Chuan* of the *Pei-shi* is recognized to be the variation of the latter. Assuming that the title under discussion is comparable to those just mentioned, we can decide this much, that the first two characters 韃吉 in 韃吉支 are to be pronounced *kan-ki* (*kan-kit*), and not *ken-ki* (*ken-kit*). As for the sound of the last character 支, we have reason to prefer *chi* to the other alternative *ki*, for the *Nihon-shoki* gives the title of a Korean king as *Konikishi* コニキシ. This last evidence, however, gives rise to the suspicion that, in spite of the above decision we have already been led to make, 韃吉 might have sounded *kon-kit* as well as *kan-kit*. Thus we are brought to face the new question whether the title was really *kan-ki-chi* or *kon-ki-chi*.

Perhaps it will help us to solve this problem, if we are to investigate the signification of the title. It is a known fact that in Sin-lo (Sira 新羅) there was the official title *chi-chih* (*kit-chih*) 吉士, and in Pai-chi the title of honour *chi-shih* (*ki-shih*) 吉師, and this makes it highly probable

that the last two characters of 韃吉支 formed a title in themselves. Then the speculation naturally follows that the first character 韃 was an honorific prefix, and this seems to be sufficiently claimable. The Korean language has two different adjectives for "great," *k'eun* and *han*, and the evidences that *han* was current in Sin-lo are to be found in the *San-kuo-shih-chi* 三國史記, in its Book of Government, where the phrase 大舍 (*ta she*, or great *she*) is mentioned as a form exchangeable with the official title of Korea, 漢舍 (*han she*). We may safely assume, then, the first character in question 韃, being sounded *kan*, was a titular prefix implying greatness, as was the case with 旱 (*chan*) in the Jenna title 旱岐 (*chan-ki*), and 干 (*kan*) in the Sin-lo title *kan-kuei* 干貴; and therefore that the whole title 韃吉支 signified "great *ki-chi*," and that its pronunciation was *kan-ki-chi*, notwithstanding its appearance as *koni-kishi* in the Japanese history, which might easily have been an error in writing. In justice to the Japanese form, however, we may remark the possibility that the character 韃 might have denoted the Korean adjective *k'eun* (great), provided, of course, that it was current in those periods as well as to-day. Then the alternative conclusion would be that, though the title was *han-ki-chi* in Sinlo and Jenna, it was *k'eun-ki-chi* in Pai-chi, and that the Japanese form *koni-kishi* was the immediate and correct copy of the latter.

No matter whether the Pai-chi title 韃吉支 sounded *kan-ki-chi* or *koni-ki-chi*, there is no doubt that it was an identical term with *han-ki* 旱岐 in the dialect of Jen-na (Mimana) and with *kan-kuei* 干貴 in that of Sin-lo. Nor is the probability altered in any way that its first component *kien* 韃 was identical with *chan* 旱 of *chan-ki* 旱岐 and *kan* 干 of *kan-kuei* 干貴, with the implication of greatness common to all; while the main body of the title, *ki-chi* 吉支, was a term of honour comparing with the *ki* and *kuei* in the other titles. From this it seems evident that *ki* or *kuei* was the root of the words, and that in the case of *ki-chi*, *chi* was a suffix. That this root *ki* or *kuei* was capable of taking other suffixes than *chi* also, can be proved by certain Korean personal names recorded in the Japanese histories. The *Nihon-shoki*, in the Book of the Empress Jingû 神功, while narrating her conquest of Sin-lo, says: "The king of Sin-lo, Ha-sa-mi-kin (Pa-sa-mi-kin) 波沙寐錦 sent Mi-shi-ko-chi ha-chin kan-ki 微叱已知波珍干岐 to be kept in Japan as hostage." Very apparently "*ha-chi kan-ki*" (*pa-chin kan-kuei*) forming part of the latter name was the same Sin-lo official title that was mentioned in the *San-kuo-shi-ki* as 波珍食 (*ha-chin-san*, *pa-chin-ts'an*), being the fourth of the seven grades there were in the Sin-lo government service. Equally clear is it that "*kan-ki*" 干岐 was identical with *chan-ki* 旱岐 and *kan-kuei* 干貴 above given. Now the same term is found in the other old history of Japan, *Ko-ji-ki* 古事記, in the paragraph relating to the Emperor Inkyô 允恭 as follows: "At this time the king

of Sin-lo sent his tribute of 81 ships by an ambassador whose name was Kinha-chin kan-ki-mu 金波鎮漢紀武.” Very probably *Ha-chin kan-ki-mu* in the name corresponded to “*Ha-chin kan-ki*” recorded in the former history. And in “kan-ki-mu” we seem to have a strong indication that the root-word *ki* was susceptible of the suffix *mu* as well as the suffix *chi*.

On the monument of Hao-t'ai Wang 好太王 of Kao-chü-li, the name of a Sin-lo king who paid his tribute to Kao-chü-li, is inscribed as 安錦 (*an-chün, an-kim*). Most likely this was not the individual name, but the assumed title, of the Sin-lo king, and so it becomes comparable with the Silo title *an ki-mu*, above noticed. Besides, its final part *kim* (*keun*) 錦 seems to connect itself with “*kim*” 錦 in *Ha-sa-mi-kim* 波沙寐錦, which we have observed above in the *Nihon-shoki* as the name of a Sin-lo king, while equal affinity may be claimed for it with 今 *chün* (*kim*) in 尼師今 *Ni-shih-chün*, (*ni-shihü-kim*), which is the royal title of the same country recorded in the *San-kuo-shi-ki*.

If I have not been misled in the above observations, it can be asserted that in the period of the Three Kingdoms, in the Korean language, there was an honorific title *ki* or *keui* which, combined with different suffixes, varied as *ki-chi* 吉支, *kim* 錦 and *keum* 今. In all probability this primary form *ki* was identical with the Fu-yü and Kao-chü-li title *kia* 加, and therefore also with the Kh'itan *χha* 呵 and the Mongol *χα* 合. Then it was nothing other than a corruption of *χan* or *χajan*.

There is another royal title of old Korea which requires our examination. The *San-kuo-shi-ki* records the founder of the Sin-lo State as Ho-chu-shih Chu-hsi-kan 赫居世居西干, which name is commented on as: “*Chu-hsi kan* (*ku-si-kan*) 居西干 was the Sin-lo word equivalent to “*wang*” 王, though another opinion says that it was a title of nobility.” Of the individual part of the name, the *San-kuo-i-shih* 三國遺事 gives this account: “His body sent out light and colours; birds and beasts danced together; heaven and earth quaked and rumbled; sun and moon shone bright and clear. Hence his name Ho-chu-shih 赫居世 (*i. e.*, brilliant life) .....while his royal title was Chu-se-han (*ku-se-χan*) 居瑟邯.” From this we learn that at one time in Sin-lo the royal title was *Ku-si-kan* or *Ku-se-χan*.

Again in the former history, we find the name of a Korean king No-chin Ma-li-kan 訥祗麻立干 annotated as: “According to Chin Ta-wen 金大問, *mali* 麻立 was the provincial for 櫛 (*ch'ueh*), which meant the sticks set up in the royal court to mark out ranks. The king's stick occupied the first place and those of the ministers ranged below. This gave origin to the title.” The same subject is treated of in the *Li-wen-pei-shuo* 禮翁釋說 as follows: “*Ma-li* 麻立 is the provincial for 櫛 (stick). In the beginning of the country, it was the custom, where sovereign and vassals met in state assembly, to erect a stick to distinguish the place of the ruler. This gave rise to the

royal title *ma-li-kan*, which signified the person who was at the stick. As for the term *kan* 干, it was a polite form used by the Sin-lo people in addressing one another."

It will be readily admitted that the suffix *kan* or *chan* common to *Ku-si-kan* 居世干, *Matikan* 麻立干 and *Ku-se-kan* 居瑟邯 was a Sin-lo title of honour, which, combined with other symbols of dignity, such as *ku-si*, *ma-li*, and *ku-se*, formed the longer titles. Can we say, however, this *kan* was directly comparable with the Mongol or Manchu title *kan*? To answer this question, it will be well to refer to the official titles in old Sin-lo. According to the *Sin-lo-chuan* in the *Pei-shi*, "There were 17 ranks in the administration, the first of which was *i-fa kan-kuei* 伊罰干貴, equivalent of 相國 (chancellor), to be followed in order by *i-ch'ih-kan* 伊尺干, *pomi-kan* 破彌干, *tai a-ch'ih-kan* 大阿尺干, *a-ch'ih-kan* 阿尺干, *i-chü-kan* 乙吉干, *sha-tu-kan* 沙土干, *chi-fu-kan* 及伏干, *tai na-ma-kan* 大奈麻干, *na-ma-kan* 奈麻干, *na-ma* 奈麻, *tai shê* 大舍, *hsiao shê* 小舍, *chi-shih* 吉支, *tai wu* 大烏, *hsiao wu* 小烏 and *tsao-wei* 造位." It might seem the title *kan-kuei* was reserved for the premier, while *kan* applied to most of the others. The *Sin-lo Chuan* of the *Liang-shu*, however, rather speaks to the contrary, saying, "The administration comprised *tsu-pen chan-k'i* 子賁旱支, *chi chan-k'i* 齊旱支, *i-kao chan-k'i* 壹告旱支, and *pei chan-k'i* 貝旱支." On the other hand, the *San-kuo-shi-ki*, while giving in its Book of Functionaries the list of 17 ranks, mentions the premier as *i-fa ts'an* 伊伐淦; which name, the history says, was exchangeable with *i-fa-kan* 伊罰干, *u-fa-ts'an* 于伐淦, *chiao (kiao) -kan* 角干, *chiao-ts'an* 角粲, *shu-fa-kan* 舒發翰, and *shu-fu-kan* 舒弗邯. The only explanation of the above accounts seems to be that the final *kan* 干 of those official titles was but the abridged form of *kan-k'i* or *kan-kuei*. This leads to the inference that the royal title *kan* in question must have been derived from the adjective denoting greatness, and that it was suggestive of *ki* or *kici* understood after it. There can be little doubt, therefore, that it is impossible to compare this *kan* with the northern title *chan*, which was an independent and integral term.

In the foregoing paragraphs we ascertained identity between *kien-ki-chi* 韃吉支 of Pai-chi, *chan-k'i* 干岐 of Sin-lo, and *chan-k'i* 旱岐 of Jen-na; but through the same evidences used, we are also led to observe indication that the title in Sin-lo applied, in particular, to lords and dignitaries, while in the two other states, it was peculiar to the king himself. This is a difference which has yet to be accounted for. In my opinion, the Sin-lo title also was at first reserved for the monarch. As has been alluded to, the name of the Sin-lo king An-kin 安錦 recorded on the monument of Hao-t'ai Wang of Kao-chü-li is very likely to have been the identical term with the Sin-lo *kan-k'i* 干岐 or *kan-ki-mu* 漢紀武, and this makes us infer that in the case of Sin-lo too, the title was held by the king himself at least at the age when

that monument was first erected, that is, in the reign of Chang-shou-wang of Kao-chü-li. Afterwards, however, when Chinese civilization began to be introduced, it is imaginable that the Sin-lo ruler assumed the Chinese title *wang* for himself, while allowing his old title to be transferred to the highest order of his subjects. This will be a reasonable analogy from the known history of “*wang*” in China, which ceased to be the sovereign title at the Ts’in emperor’s adoption of the new appellation of *huang-ti*, and which survived into the Han regime as a mere title for feudal lords.

In Jen-na, the title *han-k’i* 旱岐 seems to have continued until far later periods to be held by the master of each of the ten provinces into which the country was divided. Presumably this was owing to the peculiar condition of the country that it was under the general control of the Japanese governor, so that the local petty kings had no encouragement to change their old title for the more pretentious *wang*.

As for the title of *kien-ki-chi* in Pai-chi, again, there are some grounds for believing that in course of time it was replaced as the royal title by the Chinese *wang*, and began to apply to some qualified subjects. There is a fact on Japanese record which I think throws light on this question. It is a familiar incident in the national history that in the reign of the Emperor Ojin 應神, the government invited from Korea a great scholar by the name of Wani-kishi 和爾吉師. As the story appears in the two oldest chronicles of Japan, this seems to have been the individual name of the person, but the result of close observation of the name itself, combined with proper reflection on the circumstances which gave rise to the story, tends to suggest that it was in reality a title of doctorship.

That the final part of the name, that is *kishi*, was an honorific title may be easily admitted from what has been so far ascertained in the present study, and in fact it is so generally acknowledged by historical authorities. The question to be settled now is whether the initial part *wani* was the personal name or a titular attributive prefixed to *kichi*. I think it probable that *wani* was the corruption of *han*, the Korean adjective denoting greatness. It is a recognized fact that Japanese speech in those periods did not know the sound of *h*, so that, when foreign words containing it were imitated, it had to be replaced by the sound *k*, or perhaps by *w* sometimes, but was more often dropped altogether. A conspicuous and familiar example is the word *andon* 行燈, a kind of household lantern most commonly used in old Japan. The thing was of Chinese invention and its original name was *han-tung* 行燈, as pronounced in the Sung period, but, as we see, the initial sound *h* is lost in the Japanese name. From this we may safely infer that the original term for *wanikichi* was *han-kichi* or *hani-kisi*; *wani* being the corruption of *han*, the Korean title prefix showing magnitude.

The above view will be further confirmed by the occurrence in Japanese



history of another Pai-chi scholar by the name of Achi-kishi 阿知吉師, who is said to have come over from Pai-chi even before the so-called Wani-kishi did. As was the case with the latter name, so does this Achi kishi appear, on the face of the chronicles, to be a personal name. But here again "achi" can be demonstrated as an adjective modifier attached to the title *kishi*. The *San-kuo-i-shih* tells us that the Sin-lo word for "child" was *at-chi* 闕智, while we know that in Manchu, "small" is *achige*, and "child," *achigen*. In these northern words, *ge* and *gen* being diminutive suffixes, the stem *aci* is comparable with the Sin-lo word *at-chi*.

Thus it becomes almost certain that it was this root *achi* which went to from the term *achi kishi*, a title signifying "minor doctor" as against "major doctor," which was the meaning of the other title *wani kishi*. To test this interpretation, we may now apply it to the following passage in the *Nihon-shoki*, where the invitation of Wani, or Wani-kishi, is recorded under the 15th year of the reign of the Emperor Ojin:—

"Achiki 阿直岐 (being the same person as Achi-kishi in the other history) was so able a reader of scriptures that he was made tutor of the Crown Prince Uji-waka-iratsuko. Then the Emperor inquired of Achiki whether there was a scholar of greater erudition than himself. He replied that there was one Wani, who was very distinguished. Thereupon Aratawake 荒田別 and Kamunagi-wake 巫別, who were ancestors of the Lord of Kamutsuke, were ordered to Pai-chi on the mission of bringing home Wani. The said Achiki was the first ancestor of the Achikishi 阿直岐史, the Achiki family of historiographers."

It is noteworthy how Wani-kishi (Wani) interpreted as a senior doctor and Achi-kishi (Achiki) as a junior fit themselves well into the circumstances. We may also notice the fact that Achi-kishi was the founder of the family of scribes named after him. Wani-kishi is likewise represented in the same history as the father of the hereditary recorders 書首, while the scribe family of Kawachi 河內文首, according to the *Kogo-shui* 古語拾遺, went back to him for its origin. As is often seen in similar cases, it is most probable that the recorded incident concerning Wani and Achiki was no more than a legend told about the founders of the professional lines, not a real fact.

At all events, if *Wani-kishi* is to be admitted as a corruption of the Pai-chi title *han-ki-shi*, which was traceable to the old royal title *kan-ki-ci* 韃吉岐, it must follow that, as was the case in Sin-lo, so also in Pai-chi the appellation left the king, on his adoption of "*wang*" for himself, to pass to the highest order of his subjects, administrative and scholastic.

VI

The Title *Katun*.

It is a fact well known to every student of oriental history that in the Mongol and Turkish languages there was a title *katun*, proper to eastern empresses or princesses. So far as I am aware, however, very little has been done to reveal the etymology of the title or to ascertain where it made its first appearance in history. By way of completing the study of the title *kaghan*, therefore, it will be worth while to inquire into its feminine companion *Katun*. I am especially encouraged to do so by the etymological affinity which has already been suggested between them.

“Fu-li’s 佛狸 residence,” says the *Wei-lu Chuan* 魏虜傳 in the *Nan-chi-shu* 南齊書, in a passage relating to the ruler of the T’o-po tribe, “consisted of three edifices, one of which was named Yun-wu 雲母. Apart from them, there was erected a two-storied palace, the upper chambers of which were occupied by the master himself. Attached to its west side, there was a kitchen called *a-chên* 阿真, where it was the custom of the Empress K’o-sun (Ka-sun) 可孫 to take herself to get victuals.”<sup>1)</sup> On casual reading, it might seem “*Ka-sun*” was the personal name of the empress, but a little study will show that it was a T’o-po term corresponding to “empress” or “prince.” Notice this passage in the *Tu-yü-hun Chuan* in the *Wei-shi*, “Fu-lien-shuo died, and his son K’ua-lü ascended the throne, he himself being the first to assume the title of *kaghan*, while his wife was styled *k’o-tsun* (*ka-tsun*) 恪尊.”<sup>2)</sup> Compare this title *katsum* with the name of the T’o-po lady *Ka-sun*, and also remember the fact that the two tribes concerned both descended from the old Hsien-pei race, and it will be clear that “empress” was *ka-sun* in T’o-po, and *ka-tsun* in Tu-yü-hun speech.

The above are the two oldest evidences of the title found in history. Precedence lies with the former case, that is in the *Wei-lu Chuan* of the *Nan-chi-shu*, because Fu-li’s accession occurred in the 1st year of *T’ai-ping Chên-kiên* 太平眞君, i.e. 440 A.D.; while K’ua-lü did not begin to rule until 514 A. D. Further evidences are discovered in those T’u-chüeh inscriptions which dated from the *Kai-yüan* era of the T’ang dynasty, where the consort of the *Kaghan* is repeatedly recorded as *Katun*. No doubt this was the same title that we see transcribed as 可敦 (*K’o-tun*) in the following passage, once quoted above from the *T’u-chüeh Chuan* of the *T’ang-shu*: “Having grown great and strong, T’u-mên now assumed the title of *K’o-han*

1) Chap. 57. p. 1v.

2) Chap. 101. p. 11r.

(*kaghan*), which corresponded to *shan-yü*, while his wife was styled *k'o-tun* (*katun*) 可敦, a name comparable to *é-shih* 閼氏.<sup>1)</sup> The same event is recorded in the *T'u-chüeh Chuan* of the *Pei-shü*, which also will be quoted again as follows: "T'u-mên now styled himself I-li K'o-han. K'o-han was equal to *shan-yü* of the former times. His wife was called *k'o-ho-tun* (*kaghatun*) 可賀敦, which was equivalent to the old title *é-shih* 閼氏."<sup>2)</sup> In the latter case what is particularly noteworthy is that *katun* is varied to *kaghatun*. Again in the Mongol history *Yüan-chao-pi-shü*, the title occurs in transcript, sometimes as 合屯 (*cha-tun*), and sometimes as 合敦 (*cha-tun*), the Chinese rendering of either being 夫人 (princess or lady). It may also be noted that current Turkish has such variations of the term as *çatun*, *katin*, *kadin*, *kat*, *katyn*, *kaddy*, *çatin*, ect.

H. VAMBERY explained the original meaning of *katun* on the assumption of its Turkish derivation. Pointing out that in those languages of the Turkish family, Chagatai, Osman, and Uigur, *kat* was "side," and *katash*, "companion" or "friend," he proposed to trace the Turkish word for "wife," *katun*, to the original sense of "companion" or "mate."<sup>3)</sup> This seems quite plausible, when we remember that the Japanese *tsuma*, "wife," is understood to be a derivative of *tomo* (companion, or being together), while there is a Chinese synonym of "wife," 側室 (*ts'ê-shih*), which characters might be read "side chamber." But this etymology of *katun* will not hold before the consideration that its other form was *kaghatun* as above noticed. The idea of the ultimate identity of *ka-tun* and *ka-gha-tun* is what will easily occur and in fact it received early exposition from W. SCHOTT. The customary omission of *gh* between vowels in the Turkish language gave him the suggestion that *chaghatun* changed to *katun* or *katun*, just as *chaghan* did to *chan*. He identified *chagha* in *chaghatun* with the title *chaghan*, and thought it clear that "*tun*" was a suffix, though he did not venture to surmise what modification occurred to either the suffix or the stem as the compound word was formed. That *chaghan* and its abbreviation *chan* dropped the final *n* for the plural ending *t*, was a matter commonly observable in Mongol speech, but in this case of *chaghatun*, he was unfortunately short of parallel instances from which to judge whether *tun* was an intact or disintegrated suffix.<sup>4)</sup>

BLOCHET went a step further in the etymology of *katun*. He recognized *khatur* was derivative of *khaghatun*, which in its turn was resolvable to *khagha* and *tun*. This *tun* he had reason to believe was a feminine ending in the Ural-Altai family. In Mongolian, as seen in the examples of *bulughan*

1) Chap. 215. a. p. 4r.

2) Chap. 99. p. 2v.

3) Etymologisches Wörterbuch. No. 88.

4) Altaische Studien, pp. 3-4.

(male yellow mouse) and *bulughachin* (female yellow mouse), the replacement of the final *n* by *chin* resulted in the feminine gender. Now the Turkish dental *t* or *d* was capable of changing to *chi* or *ži* in Mongol, and from this he could infer that the Turkish *tun* was a feminine suffix comparable with Mongolic *chin*.<sup>1)</sup> The theory he drew that *kaghan* transformed itself into *kaghatun* by exchanging the final *n* for the feminine ending *tun*, seems to me entirely acceptable. From the above examples of the T'o-po *kasun* and the Tu-yü-hun *katsun*, we can further assume that the same suffix sounded in the Hsien-pei language *sun* or *tsun*, which shows even higher affinity with the Mongolic ending *kĕin* or *ĕin*.

“The Yü-wen 宇文 tribe called ‘mother’ *mo-tun* (*ma-tun*) 磨敦,” says the *Chu-shih-i-yü-chieh-i* 諸史夷語解義 (Barbaric Glossary in Chinese Histories). Apparently the final *tun* of *ma-tun* was traceable to the above observed *tun*. Again the *Liao-shi* 遼史, in its section of the native glossary of Kh'itan, says that *nou-wa* 耨斡 was “earth” and *ma* 麼 was “mother.” It would seem “*ma*” was a common term in both cases but if we were to interpret *ma* in the Yü-wen word *ma-tun* as “mother,” the feminine suffix *tun* would be a redundancy hard to account for. In Manchu *ama* was “father,” and *eme* “mother.” In this case, the change of vowel from hard to soft sufficed for the purpose of distinction, and there was no need of a suffix. But in the Yü-wen case of *ma-tun*, seeing that the suffix *tun* was added for discrimination, it is to be reasonably inferred that in that language *ma* signified “father,” not “mother.” In like manner, the Chuvash word for “mother,” *ameši* or *amši*, can be traced back to *ama* (father), by divesting it of the suffix *ši*. As for the Kh'itan word *ma*, however, it was an independent term for “mother” while “father” is known to have been *a-chu* 阿主.

In the above quotations from the *Pei-shi* and the *T'ang-shu*, we read that *kaghan* was equivalent to the former title *shan-yü*, and *katun*, to *ê-chi*, the female counterpart of the latter. That *kaghan* and *shanyü* had no etymological connection between them has been already affirmed, but it remains a question whether it was the same with *katun* and *ê-chi*.

LAUFER referred to the comment on the title *achi*, found in the *Hiung-nu-chuan* of the *Shi-chi*, which ran as follows: “According to the So-yin 索隱, *ê-chi* 闕氏, whose original pronunciation was 曷氏 (ho-chi), was the title of the Hiung-nu empress,” and on this evidence he read the title as *had-di* or *hat-ti*. This he proposed to compare with the Turkish title *khatun*, and to set forth as the original Hiung-nu term to which the T'o-po title *kasun* and the Tu-yü-hun *katsun* were attributable.<sup>2)</sup> I think much depends

1) Les Inscription de l'Orkhon (*Revue Archéologique*, 1898), p. 31, note 3.

2) The Language of the Yüe-chi or Indo-scythians. p. 10, note 1.

upon the inquiry as to whether the character 闕 in the transcription 闕氏 was really sounded *had*, as suggested. In the *T'ang-yün* 唐韻, its archaic sound is given as *wat* (the phonetic spelling, 烏割切) while in the pronouncing lexicographies, *Chi-yün* 集韻, *Yün-hui* 韻會, and *Ch'eng-yün* 正韻, it appears as *at* (phonetic spelling 阿葛切). The latter sound is preserved in Japan as *at(su)*, in Korea *ar* (*viz.* *at*) and in Annam *at*, and in Canton dialect *at*. As to its pronunciation in the Han period, there is sufficient evidence in the literature of that age to indicate that it was *at* or *an*, but not *hat*.<sup>1)</sup>

Moreover, even if we were to grant the character 闕 sounded *hat* and that the transcribed title 闕氏 was to be pronounced *hat-çi*, still it would be no evidence of the original Hiung-nu term having been *had-di* or *hat-ti*. For it was a long-established custom with the Chinese to employ a character beginning with the *h* sound, in reproducing alien words which commenced with such vowels as *a*, *o*, *u*, etc. This may be illustrated in the *Hui-hu Chuan* 回鶻傳 of the *T'ang-shu* by the transcript 合 (*hap*) as against the Uigur original *alp* (courage), and also by 曷刺 (*hat-lat*) as against *ala-at* (parti-coloured horse).

These considerations, it must be admitted, make it less probable that the Hiung-nu title *at-çi* had any connection with the Turkish *katun*. For my part, I should rather claim to compare it with the Tunguse words for "wife," *asi*, *asa*, *asi*, *ashi*, *azi*, *azin*, *asiw*, *açiu*, etc., of which *asi* and *açiu*

---

1) In the *Chao-hsien Chuan* 朝鮮傳 of the *Shi-chi*, there is the phrase "擁闕弗通" (stopped and obstructed, impervious); and in the *Ching-shih-san-wang Chuan* 景十三王傳 of the *Han-shu*, concerning *Chung-shan-ching-wang Sheng* 中山請王勝, "雍闕不得聞" (stopped and obstructed, unable to hear); and still earlier in the *Yang-tzu-pien* 楊子篇 of *Lieh-tzu* 列子 "勿雍勿闕" (not stop, not obstruct); in every case 擁 and 闕 going together to convey the idea of hindrance. Then in the *Shih-fa-chieh* 誼法解, (the book of interpretation of posthumous titles), in the *Shi-chi-cheng-i* 史記正義 by the Tang commentator Chang Shou-chieh 張守節, there is "壅遏不通曰齒" (The state of being stopped and obstructed is described as 齒). The characters 壅遏 in this case were substitutes for 擁闕, obviously of the same value in sense and sound. Now, 遏 was pronounced *at* in the Han period, and we may assume it was the same with 闕.

There are also indications that 闕 sounded like the character 焉 in the same period. The name of an era which is recorded as 闕逢 in the *Shi-chi* appears as 焉逢 in the *Han-shu*. Again, as M. PELLIOU has already pointed out, the same person given as 休屠王闕氏 in the *Chin-mi-ti Chuan* 金日磾傳 of the *Han-shu* (ch. 68) is mentioned as "休屠王焉提" in the *Lan-tung-pien* 亂龍篇 of Wang-ch'ung's 王充 *Luang-heng* 論衡, evidence that 闕氏 and 焉提 sounded the same in the later Han period. However, the sound of the character 焉 in that period is not ascertainable, but the above is at least proof that 闕 had another sound besides *at*. Now, the personal name written as 董闕于 in the *Chao Shih Chia* 趙世家 in the *Shi-chi* (ch. 43) is replaced by 董安于 in Chapter I of the *Nai-ch'u-shuo* 內儲說 of *Han-fei-tzu* 韓非子, enabling us to infer that 闕 sounded like 安, whose pronunciation there can be no doubt was *an*. Moreover, the *Sing-lui* 聲類 (ch. 2) by Ch'ien Ta-kin 錢大昕, quotes Hsiu-kuang 徐廣 as commenting, "單闕 was pronounced 單安 (*tan-an*)."<sup>2)</sup> This confirms that the other sound of 闕 was *an*.

seem to be the most approximate ones. In current Korean, it may be added, a mistress is spoken of by a servant as *assi* (아씨), while in the same language of the Kao-chü-li age, a lady was called *a-ün* (아은). No doubt both words are akin to the Tunguse *asi* and *ašin*, and thus reduceable to the same origin as the the Hiung-nu title for the empress.

Western orientalists do not doubt that the Hiung-nu was a race of the Turkish stock, and therefore are apt to explain Hiung-nu speech by means of Turkish vocabulary. LAUFER's theory just criticized is one of many instances. Lately, F. W. K. MÜLLER offered an interpretation of the Hiung-nu equivalent of the Chinese title *T'ien-tzu* 天子, *ch'eng-li ku-tu* 撐犁孤塗; he proposed to trace it to *tänri kut* 登里汜 included in *tängridä kut bulmis* 登里囉汜沒密施, the title of the Uigur *kaghan* which was frequently met in records, thus reducing it to the Turkish term which, he thought, implied "heilige Majestät" (holy majesty).<sup>1</sup> But such is a speculation open to obvious objections. Firstly, it is at variance with the once quoted explanation of the title in the *Han-shu*, saying "The Hiung-nu call heaven *ch'eng-li* and son *ku-t'u*," and there seems no reason to force upon *ku-t'u*, in spite of that evidence, the sense of majesty belonging to the Turkish *kut*. Secondly, the alleged original term *kut* would have been copied by a single character of the entering tone, just as was the case with the Uigur *kut* turned into 汜; whereas we read the two characters 孤塗 in its place. Thirdly, it was wrong to interpret the title in the abstract sense of majesty; we have already seen that it was adopted in imitation of the Chinese imperial title *t'ien-tzu* 天子 (the son of heaven).

I may venture to remark that this sort of theory is product of the long-established practice of attributing the Hiung-nu people to the Turkish race, and of the persisting inclination to connect their words with those of the latter. According to the results of my investigation, however, the Hiung-nu, as their alternative name Hu 胡 may indicate, were of the same race as the Tung-hu 東胡. They were mainly Mongolic, but being Tunguse to some extent, it is no wonder they have some Tunguse words in their language. We have already observed how the Hiung-nu title for the *shan-yü's* empress, written 闕氏, was traceable to the Tunguse *ači*, and we may as reasonably believe that the component title under discussion, 孤塗 (*ku-t'u*), was also a Tunguse term, which was reduceable to the same origin as *hutta* or *guto*, "son" or "child" in that tongue.

The western conviction in the identical relation of the Hiung-nu and the Turks, goes even so far that sometimes the explanation of such Hiung-nu words as found incomparable with Turkish is sought in the language of the Sogd, the western neighbours of the Turks. For example, Müller,

1) Uigurische Glossen (*Festschrift für F. Hirth*), p. 316.

reading the Hiung-nu title 關氏 as *yen-č'i*, as suggested by Yen Shiku's note, associated it with the Sogd word *inč*.

But the title was certainly the Tunguse *ač'i*, while the other expressed as *kasun* 可孫 in T'o-po, *katsun* 恪尊 in Tu-yü-hun, and *katun* 可敦 in T'u-chueh, was Mongolic. Of course there can be no identification between the two. It is not impossible, however, to admit a certain remote connection in their etymology. Perhaps the Mongol *katun*, shifting through *katsun*, *kasun*, *χasun*, and *hasun*, arrived at *asun*, and this might have merged in the Tunguse *sai* or *aci*. What seems equally possible is that *kaghan* passed through *χaγan*, *haγan*, and *han*, to *an*, which, taking the feminine suffix *si* or *č'i* developed itself into *asi* or *ač'i*.

---