

Ĵuwainī (I, 26, 28, 253) has adopted نموجين Tāmūrčīn, while granting the possibility of نموجين Tāmū čīn. Of course, a confusion between , and , is easy in Arabic script; I think, however, that Tāmūrčīn is really the form originally adopted by Ĵuwainī. My opinion rests to some extent on the fact that Ĵuwainī generally gives the Turkish forms of Mongols names, like An-Nāsāwī and the *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāsiri*, and the latter two works give Tāmūrjī or Tāmūrči, not *Tāmūči. But there is more. Bar Hebraeus's information regarding the Mongols is copied wholesale from Ĵuwainī. His Arabic chronicle would seem to favour «Tāmūjīn», since such is the form found in POCOCCKE's edition (*Historia Dynastiarum*, text, 427, 428; transl., 280, 281), though this may be due to the easy misreading of , ū for , r in Arabic. There is no such ambiguity in Syriac script, however, and Bar Hebraeus, in his Syriac chronicle, writes the name as Tāmūršīn (*i.e.* Tāmūrčīn; BRUNS ed., text, 438; transl., 449). That such was the form which reached the West is confirmed by Georgian texts, where the name occurs as «Themurči» (BROSSET, *Hist. de la Géorgie*, 488).

But *tāmūrči* in Turkish, *tāmūrči* or *tāmūrčīn* in Mongolian is the *nomen agentis* derived from *tāmūr*, «iron», and means «blacksmith» (RAVERTY is mistaken, p. 936, when he says that *tāmūrči* means «iron-like», and not «blacksmith»). So we need not be surprised when Rubrouck says that Chinghiz-khan had been a smith. The same tradition is found in Hethum (*Hist. des Croisades*, Arm., II, 148, 284), in Nuwairī (cf. *Oh*, I, 36; I cannot trace the original passage), in Pachymeres (Bonn ed., I, 345-346), and in Ibn-Baṭṭūṭah (III, 22). From TIMKOVSKIĪ's travels, it would even seem that some similar belief still lingered in Eastern Mongolia at the beginning of the last century (cf. TIMKOVSKI, *Voyage à Péking*, I, 179; SCHMIDT's critic, in *Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 376, is prejudiced).

But if the Mongols themselves had a tradition, however unfounded, that Chinghiz-khan had been a smith, that would imply that the Turkish form, Tāmūrči, was not an erroneous equivalence and that the same meaning attached to «Tāmūjīn» among the Mongols themselves. This I believe to have been the case. The modern Mongol word for «smith» is *tāmūrči*, but I know of no example of the word in mediaeval texts. There is, however, a case quite similar and perfectly clear. The modern Mongol word for a cowherd is *ükärči*, the *nomen agentis* of *ükär*, «ox». But the mediaeval form, attested in Mongol texts, and, as a proper name, in Chinese and Persian texts as well as in Polo, is *hügäči*, *hükäčīn*, with the fall of the final *-r* of *hükär* > *ükär* (see «Cogacin»). I even suspect that the final *-r* was dropped with other suffixes than *-či* (*-ji*, *-čīn*, *-jin*). The name of Chinghiz-khan's sister «Tämülün» (*Secret History*, §§ 60, 79, 99) seems to have been formed with *tämür*, plus the feminine suffix *-lün*; and «Tämüdär» (*ibid.* § 278) probably represents *tämür*, plus the suffix *-dar*, *-där*.

From HAENISCH in *TP*, 1913, 21, 113, it would seem that Tāmūjīn survived as a proper name until the 17th cent. But the name restored by HAENISCH as «Bügen Temüčīn» is uncertain; there are other possible explanations (*Bugente Mujan, etc.).

According to the *Secret History* (§§ 60, 61, 68), Chinghiz-khan was nine years old when his father Yäsügäi was poisoned by the Tatars; but he was thirteen according to Rašidu-'d-Dīn (*Ber*, II, 89, 90). All sorts of dates have been proffered for Yäsügäi's death by adding either nine or thirteen to the different dates given for his son's birth: they range from 1175 in WOLFF (p. 34)