

(cf. Turk. *ot-tegin*, اوتكين Otägin = Ot-tägin in Juwainī, > Mong. *ot-čigin*). The alternations in the transcriptions are due to the fact that there was no longer a tradition as to the pronunciation, and -q- or -ʔ-, š or s, t or d, k or g, o or u are not distinguished in Mongolian script. The *-digit-* of the *Secret History* suggests that *-tiki-* and *-tigi-* may stand for *-tiki[t]-* and *-tigi[t]-*, but a fall of the final -n of *tigin* is also possible in Mongolian manuscripts. Whether we should take the whole name to stand for Alaquš, who was known as Alaquš-tigin, «Prince Alaquš» (in Turkish), and had the additional title of *quri*, or as Alaquš, who was a *tigit-quri*, «chief of princes» (there is also a plural in *ja'ut-quri*), the fact remains that *quri* was a title, which I hold to be identical with the *quri* of *ja'ut-quri*. In *La Haute Asie* (p. 27), I have accepted the explanation of *ja'ut-quri* as «centurion», «head of a century», and I still believe that it has a fair chance of being etymologically correct (a connection of *ja'ut* with the mysterious 𐰽 troops of the Liao and the Chin, if we read the character as **chao*, though not impossible, is improbable; on these troops, cf. *TP*, 1929, 128-129; *Chin shih*, 57, 10 b). But it may be that, taking the term at its face value, I have underrated what it represented. Of course, the titles given to chiefs of non-Jučen tribes remained much inferior to the real Chinese titles of the Jučen officials; not only a *ja'ut-quri*, but even a *wang*, «king», like Ong-khan, ranked low in the Liao and Jučen hierarchy. We must take into account, however, that we find *quri* as the title of the chief of the Öngüt, who were a numerous tribe, long in the service of the Chin, and of great importance to them because they guarded the frontier. Though all *quri* need not have been of the same importance, Tämüjin, «chief of hundreds [? not only 'of a century']» may, after all, have already been more than an insignificant local leader in 1196.

THE ENTHRONEMENT OF 1206. — Polo says that Chinghiz-khan was chosen king of the «Tartars» in 1187. RAMUSIO alone gives «1162» instead, and PENZER (*Pe*, 188) says that the latter date «agrees with the Chinese annals»; but the Chinese annals give 1162 as the date of Chinghiz-khan's birth, not of his election as king. Most of Polo's dates are unreliable; one may doubt, moreover, Polo's ability to equate a more or less remote Chinese, Uighur, or Persian date to a precise year of the Western calendar. In the present case, Polo has very naturally been supposed to refer to Chinghiz-khan's final proclamation as overlord of Mongolia and potential universal monarch, which must have taken place in 1206. But the *Secret History* suggests an earlier proclamation as king of the Mongols. «Sanang Setsen» (SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 71), the Sum-pa Hutuhtu (cf. VASIL'EV, in *ZVOIRAO*, IV, 375) and 'JIGS-MED NAM-MKHA (cf. HIRTH, *Gesch. des Buddhismus*, II, 15) agree in saying that in 1189 Chinghiz-khan was hailed as king of the Mongols («Sog» or «Bete»). According to T'U CHI (3, 1 a), the same date is given in the *Secret History*. As a matter of fact, the *Secret History* (§ 141) merely speaks of a «hen» year, which would agree indeed with 1189, but with 1201 as well, and the latter date is much more probable (NAKA, *Chingisu-kan jitsuroku*, 143, adopts 1201). The texts which give 1189 have confused two duodenary cycles. The *Li-tai fo-tsu t'ung-t'sai* (致, XI, 30 a) makes Chinghiz begin his campaigns in 1191, we do not know on what authority. I leave aside the texts of «Sanang Setsen» (SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Ost-Mongalen*, 83-85) and of the Sum-pa Hutuhtu (VASIL'EV, *ibid.* 376) according to which Chinghiz-khan became «Emperor of China» in 1194: both texts seem to refer to the final