

Even in Turkish, and for words which do not belong to the « palatal » class, we find in the late Uighur redaction of the legend of Oγuz-khan (? Uγuz-khan) such forms as *čang* (< *tang*), *čašqarun* (< *tašqarun*), *čaptilar* (< *taptilar*); cf. *TP*, 1930, 270, 342, 347. In the middle of the 13th cent., the Mongolian name of Chinghiz-khan's eldest son Jöči was known in Turkish circles as Töši, written توشي Töši in Juwainī, and « Tossuc » and « Tossuccan » (= \*Tossu-can) in Plan Carpine (*Wy*, 58, 65). A similar direct passage Turk. *tängiz* > Mong. Čingis is far from impossible.

But an intermediary form \**tingiz* is so much the more acceptable since a first -i- vowel is attested in some Turkish dialects. In Turkish the word is *tängiz* in Kāšyarī (BROCKELMANN, 203), « *tengiz* » (= *tengiz*) in the *Codex Cumanicus* (KUUN ed., 38, 88), Čay. تينگيز *tengiz* (or *tingiz*?; not *tängiz* as in RADLOV), late Uigh., Kar., Turkī *tängiz*, Kirgh. *teñiz*, Tel., Kmd, Alt. *tāñis*, yuzz دینگيز *dingiz* (*Ber*, I, 6), Krm. *dāñiz*, Osm. دنگيز *dāñiz*, Kaz. *diñiz* (RADLOV, III, 1045, 1055, 1661, 1667, 1756). An uncertainty in the nature of the first vowel is moreover traceable in the very name Čingis. The Armenians wrote it « Čangz » = \*Čang<sup>1</sup>z, which explains Hethum's « Changuis » and « Canguis ». A first *a* vowel occurs also in Ricoldo da Montecroce's « Camiustan » (< \*Canguiscan), and in the cognate corrupt forms of San Antonino and Chaucer. Even now, the Moghols of Afghanistan pronounce it « Čāngiz χān » (RAMSTEDT, *Mogholica*, 25).

The transcriptions of « Činggis » in Persian, Arabic, Turkish, and Armenian are also noteworthy on account of the final -z, when these languages possess both *s* and *z*; there is on the contrary no *z* in the Mongol language. Now, when transcribing Mongol words ending in -s, the -s has been retained in Persian, Armenian, etc., for instance, in *qaraunas* (see « Caraunas »), in « Nangias » (see « Mangi »), in *kāriyās* (the name of the place where horses were kept under guard outside the camp); why should the case be different with « Činggis »? On the other hand, if we suppose that « Činggis » was borrowed from a palatalized form of *tängiz*, the -z of the transcriptions Čingiz, Čang<sup>1</sup>z would be traceable to the original foreign word. It may even be that at first the Mongols used this borrowed word with a final -z. Although there was no *z* in Mongolian, the Mongols could pronounce it, and the letter *z* existed in the Uighur script which the Mongols made their own. At the end of a word, later Mongol usage wrote for -s the Uighur -s or the Uighur -z, indifferently; but this need not have been the original practice when they first wrote their language in Uighur script. Now, the only document in the Mongol language which is an original dating as far back as Chinghiz-khan's lifetime is the so-called « stone of Chinghiz-khan » preserved at Leningrad, which was engraved c. 1225. It begins with the name of Chinghiz-khan, but the final letter of the first word is the final Uighur -z, not -s. Although it may have already been used by the Mongols in the value of -s, I do not dismiss the possibility that the form intended was actually \*Činggis (in the archaic Mongol dialect of the Moghols of Afghanistan, « Čāngiz » has a final -z). Whatever the case may be, the script itself may have helped in the change from \*Činggis (< \*Tinggis) to Čingis. No attention need be paid, however, to the occurrence of would-be Turkish word *čingiz*, « great », « powerful », in RADLOV's dictionary (III, 2117). This word is to be found only in Chinghiz-khan's name, and by oversight it was taken over from Abū'l-Ghāzī, where this Mongolian, not Turkish, form is followed by the explanation given by RADLOV.

By a remarkable coincidence, Ibn Baṭṭūṭah, when speaking of Chinghiz-khan, always calls him تانگيز Tängiz (III, 22-27, 40, 57, 86; IV, 258, 300). I have heard the opinion that this was due