Now, Na-hu-li 納忽里 in the *Ha-mi-uei-chuan*, the name of the emperor of Qomul who might be called the forefather of the Imperial family of Ha-mi in the Ming dynasty, is nothing other than a miscopy of Wu-na-shih-li 兀納失里 that is found in various parts of the *Ming-shih-lu*, the name of a powerful chief under the reign of Tokus-Temür 脱古思帖木兒, the emperor of Northern Yüan empire. It has been pointed out by Dr. Paul PELLIOT that there must have been somo relation between this Wu-na-shih-li and the princes of Wei-wu-hsi-ning 威武西寧, Pin 豳 and Su 肅 all recorded in the list of princes of the *Yüan-shih* 元史. The present writer investigates the annual records of *Yüan-shih* and describes the status of Qomul at the end of Yüan dynasty through the beginning of Ming dynasty by tracing the descent of the Mongolian feudal princes in the Tangut District during the Great Mongolian reign.

On the Tibetan Conjunctive Suffixes *-te*, *-ste*, and *-de*

By Zuihō YAMAGUCHI

In Tibetan the conjunctive suffixes *-te*, *-ste* and *-de* are distinguished only in samdhi, but not in use. However, when we classify their uses in classical Tibetan, we can find two different usages. The one is to combine two sentences or predicates in temporal sequence, while the other is to connect them in no such relations.

In Si-tu's grammar is quoted a passage from the *Smra-baḥi-sgo* (" the Gate of Language "), where *lhag-ma bcas* is considered to be a specific use of the demonstrative pronoun *de*. In this case Si-tu cites only *-de* as the example from among the conjunctives mentioned above. This shows nothing but his misunderstanding. Obviously the *Smra-baḥi sgo* considers that the pronoun *de* may function as a connective without respect to samdhi, though no temporal relations are implied.

The present writer endeavors to point out these facts by adducing varions instances from classical Tibetan texts and at the same time to explain how the pronoun *de* came to denote the connective function. According to him, the conjunctive *-ste* is originally the pronoun *de* in connective usage combined with the suffix *-s* which may have characterized the event expressed by the preceding sentence as temporally anterior to that of the following sentence. Curious uses of *-te* and *-ste* in the Khri Sron Lde Brtsan Edicts and the contrast between *-s te* and *-s ste* in the *Shol rdo-riṅ* reflect the oldr distinction of usage. Besides, the orthographical peculiarities in the Tun-huan Documents may be also taken into consideration.

In short, against the traditional view that *-te* and *-de* are derived from *-ste* owing to euphonic rule, the writer intends to maintain that *-de* (or *-te*) and *-ste* were originally different morphemes and therefore were distinguished in usage, but they had been gradually confused, so that they became to be considered as variants of one and the same suffix.