

is, moreover, the mediaeval expression of a belief which goes back to the early Hsiung-nu. So «Činggis» has nothing to do with *t'ien-tz'ü*. The same may be said of VASIL'EV's alternative solution (*ibid.* iv, 379) that «Činggis» may be a transcription of *t'ien-tzū*, «Son of Heaven»; the mediaeval transcriptions from Mongolian or into Mongolian are much too accurate to admit of such an unaccountable corruption. I shall not stop to discuss the «Chingsze, *i. e.* perfect warrior» of DOUGLAS, *The life of Jenghis Khan*, 54.

Rašid says three times (*Ber*, I, 159; III, 8, 112) that «Čingiz» is the plural of *čing*, which in Mongolian means «firm» (مستحکم), or «powerful and strong» (قوی و سخت), so that the name is tantamount to «king of kings» (*pādšāh-i pādšāhān*) or «emperor of emperors» (*šahinšāh*). This plural was, according to Rašid (*Ber*, I, 159) a plural *majestatis* applied to Chinghiz-khan himself; D'OHSSON's «khan of the powerful ones» (*Oh*, I, 99) is not in accordance with the text. The tradition passed on to Abū'l-Ghāzī (DESMAISONS, text, 81; transl., 88) who says, in Turkish, that «Čingiz» is the plural of *čing*, and that the latter word means «great» (*uluy*) and «firm» (*qatı*). SCHMIDT objected (*Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 379) that *čing* was an adverb, meaning «solidly», «immoveably», which could have no plural, and BANZAROV concurred with him. But in vain: ERDMANN, relying on the consensus of Mussulman writers, maintained that they could not have erred, and derived from their explanations the very title of his book, «*Temudschin der Unerschütterliche*» (cf. his long note, pp. 599-609). SCHMIDT's argument was not of the soundest. *Čing* often is an adverb, but it can also be used as an adjective (the cognate *činya* is only an adjective), and plurals of adjectives are known in ancient Mongolian (for instance *yākās* in the *Secret History*, §§ 230, 271). A much stronger objection would have been to point out that, if *čing* had a plural, it could only have been **čingut*, not *činggis*. It seems clear that Rašid's informants had no longer a tradition to guide them to the meaning and origin of «Činggis», and that they imagined an etymology which afterwards met with undue success. Their ignorance is shown by the parallel case of *gürhan*, always explained by Rašid in the passage where he comments on «Čingiz». According to him, *gür* means «firm» (مستحکم), or «powerful and great» (قوی و معظم). The word *gür* existed, however, and still exists in Mongolian, and the translators of the *Secret History* have correctly rendered it «universal» (see «Catai»). Except for the sake of completeness, I would not mention BLOCHET's explanation of «Činggis han» (*Moufazzal*, 532-533) as a «purely Mongolian» title «Činkiz qayan», «Emperor of the brave men», -z being the mark of the plural. Neither a word **činkki*, nor a plural in -z exist in Mongolian.

BANZAROV (*Černaya Véra*, 78) proposed to see in «Činggis» the old Hsiung-nu title transcribed in Chinese as 單于 *shan-yü*, the ancient sound of which, according to BIČURIN, was «čen-yü». This was for the time a clever suggestion, which ERDMANN's supercilious refutation (*Temudschin*, 607-608) hardly affects. But BANZAROV was misinformed about the ancient pronunciation of the Chinese: *shan-yü* is an ancient **žiän-jiu* (? from a more archaic **žiän-gju*), and I do not believe that the ancient sonant initial of the Hsiung-nu original could give an initial č- in Mongolian (I leave out the pronunciation *tan-yü*, **tân-jiu*, adopted by DE GROOT, which I consider to be erroneous). On the other hand, we should not lay too much stress on the following point, the only reasonable one among the seven raised by ERDMANN, that if «Činggis» was the mediaeval form of the term transcribed *shan-yü* in ancient times, it would form a title by itself, which would