

paper which I cannot trace for the present, VLADIMIROV remarked that such a derivation was improbable, since both «Činggis» and *tānggis*, «sea», occurred in the *Secret History* (§ 1). I do not think that this objection is of great moment. Double forms occur in the *Secret History*; for instance «Idil» and «Äjil», discussed further on. Moreover, if we are right, both «Činggis» and *tānggis* were foreign words in Mongolian; *tānggis* entered the legend of Mongol origins, closely connected with the ancient legend of the early Turks, at an unknown date, but there is no reason to date this contemporaneously with that at which «Činggis» became in certain religious or political circles the accepted term it must have been to have been adopted by Chinghiz-khan. If the two forms came to the Mongols at different periods and through different channels, and moreover acquired different uses, we need not be surprised to find both occurring in the same work.

Mong. *tānggis*, «sea», is an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in the *Secret History*, and is of rare occurrence elsewhere. KOWALEWSKI does not give it. Late Sino-Mongolian lexicography knew it, however (cf. KLAPROTH, *Asia Polyglotta*, 263), and it is found in GOLSTUNSKIĪ. In the Mongol period, it occurs in YS, 63, 16 a, as *t'ien-chi-ssü*, *tāngis*, in the name of the Caspian (cf. JA, 1920, I, 166). The word is current in Kalmuk, and pronounced *teŋis* (RAMSTEDT, *Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 392). *Tāngis* is merely borrowed from the Turkish *tāngiz* (*tāniz*), but is written according to the rules of Mongolian spelling, where Turk. -ng- (-ñ-) is rendered as -ngg- (-ñg-), and where -z becomes -s since there is no z in Mongolian.

The case of Turk. *tāngiz* > Mong. Činggis would be somewhat different. The treatment of the final -z > -s is the same, but the initial č- implies a mongolization. In Mongolian, all ancient *ti- became či- at an early date, for instance in the pronoun of the second person či < *ti. I have quoted above the case of Turk. *tegin*, *tägin* (< proto-Mong. *tegin) > *tigin* > Mong. čigin (in *ot-čigin*). This process of palatalization went on in Mongolian even after the 13th-14th cents. We still find in the *Secret History* (§ 262) «Idil» alongside of «Äjil» (§ 274) as a name of the Volga («Ajl», for «Äjil», in the Ulān-Bātor ms.; the 也 只 里 Yeh-chih-li River [ho] of YS, 121, 2 b, and the A-chih-li Lake [hai-tzū] of the map of the *Yuān shih lei-pien* may represent other originals). Cf. Turk. Ätil in Kāšyarī (not «İtil» as in BROCKELMANN, 244), Čay. Ätil and Idil (Edil), Kirgh. Edil, Tel. Ädäl, Kaz. Idil (RADLOV, I, 842, 850, 857, 1509; *Proben*, II, transl., p. XII), Ethil in Plan Carpine (*Wy*, 136), Etilia and Ethilia in Rubrouck (*Wy*, 195, 205, 210, 216, 223, 315), Edil in the Catalan Map (BUCHON, in *Not. et Extr.*, XIV, II, 131); Mong. Äjil (KOWALEWSKI, 227), New Mong. Ijil (VLADIMIROV, *Doklady Ak. Nauk*, 1929, 289), Kalm. Ijil, Idžl (VLADIMIROV, *ibid.*; RAMSTEDT, *Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 205). The same obtains in the case of the Irtysh, called in the *Secret History* Ärdiš (§§ 207, 264) or Ärdis (§ 198; the latter form is a misreading of the transcribers; the ancient Mongolian script did not distinguish -s and -š), Yeh-êrh-ti-shih (Ärdiš) in YS, I, s. a. 1206 and 1208; 122, 1 b; Yeh-li-ti-shih in YS, 22, 1 a; Yeh-êrh-ti-shih in the *Shêng-wu ch'in-chêng lu* (47 a); cf. Ärtiš in Kāšyarī (misread «Artiš» in BROCKELMANN, 240); Ertič in Kirakos (PATKANOV, *Istoriya Mongolov*, II, 82). But the Mongol name is Ärcis in «Sanang Setsen» (cf. SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Ost-Mongolen*, 211, 412), or more probably Ärjis as in the Chinese translation of that work (*Mêng-ku yüan-liu chien-chêng*, 6, 22 b).

A derivation Turk. *tāngiz* > Mong. Činggis would require either the existence of an intermediary form *tingiz, or the palatalization t- > č- before vowels other than i. Both are possible.