

to the absence of *č* in Arabic, but the argument is unsound. Ibn Baṭṭūṭah might have resorted to the old Arabic device of transcribing *č* with *ś*, as he does in the inherited spelling *Śin* of the name of China (see « Cin »). Above all, he might have done in this case what he did in all other cases, that is to say, write *ĵ* instead and in value of *č*. For instance, we find in his text جرخ *Ĵarĵ* for the Persian *Čarĵ* (III, 88), جوطرى *Ĵautāri* for the Hindī *čaudharī* (III, 388, and cf. YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², s. v. « chowdry »), جركس *Ĵärkäs* for the Turko-Persian *Čärkäs* (II, 448; see « Čic »), سراجوق *Sarājūq* for the Turkish *Saraičiq*. If he did not do the same for the Mongolian « Činggis », it must have been either because he heard the name pronounced « Tängiz », or because he or his informants connected it with the Turk. *tängiz*, « sea » (YULE's tentative explanation connecting it with Ar. *tänkīs*, « upside down » [Y, I, 247] cannot be seriously considered).

« Tängiz » occurs in real or legendary Altaic onomastic at an early date. I leave aside the name of Attila's son Δεγγιζιχ, which MARQUART thought was derived from *tengiz*, *deñiz* (*Die Chronologie der alttürk. Inschriften*, 109; *Izv. R. Arkh. Inst. v Konstantinople*, xv [1911], 26). Although the name strongly recalls the Turkish word for « sea », and still more the « tengizich » (= **tengizik*), « auster », « southern wind », of the *Codex Cumanicus* (Kuun, 181; left unexplained by RADLOV, *Das türk. Sprachmaterial des Codex Comanicus*, 127, but perhaps a derivative form of *tängiz*), the initial *d-* of Δεγγιζιχ is hard to explain, since all the ancient forms of *tängiz* begin with *t-*; Osmanli or Kazan forms with *d-* are out of the question at such an early date. But, in the legend of Uighur origin, Oyuz-khan's youngest son was Tengiz-[? Tingiz]-khan (Abū'l-Ghāzī, DESMAISONS's transl., 27; cf. also RAVERTY, 881) or Dengiz-[? Dingiz]-khan (*Ber*, I, 6). Whatever the origin of « Činggis », there is no doubt that Chinghiz-khan, when taking this title, intended that he should be considered sovereign of the universe. The ocean, supposed to surround the earth, provided a convenient term for it. We know that Chinghiz-khan's successors held the same view. The real Mongol word for « ocean », « sea », is *dalai*, corresponding to Turk. *talui*. In the *Secret History* (§ 280), Ögödäi, Chinghiz's third son and successor, is spoken of as *dalai-in qa'an*, « oceanic Emperor ». When Güyük, Ögödäi's successor, writes to Pope Innocent IV in 1246, the Turkish preamble of his Persian letter gives him the title of *talui-nung han*, and his Mongol seal that of *dalai-in qan*, both having the same meaning as in the case of Ögödäi (*Pe*, 22-24). One century later, the 'Phags-pa text of the Chü-yung-kuan inscriptions (l. 17) speaks of the Mongol Emperor as *talayi-yin eĵän ulus-un qa'an*, « master of the ocean, Emperor of the Nation ». On account of this last formula, I now believe that Stephen Orbelian had in view the same title when he spoke of Mongka as « master of the earth and the sea ». It is well known that *rgya-mcho*, « ocean », was used in the same way in Tibetan, and that the same image lies at the basis of the Mongol-Tibetan title of the Dalai-lama, « Oceanic religious lord », i. e. « Universal ».

So I think it probable that « Činggis » is derived from the Turk. *tängiz*, « sea », « ocean ». Such is not, however, the opinion expressed by VLADIMIRCOV in his *Čingis-khan* (p. 45). While seeing in « Činggis » the old title *shan-yü* of the Hsiung-nu sovereigns, BANZAROV had drawn attention to a god « Ĥajir Činggis tängri », mentioned in a Mongolian shamanist text (*Černaya Véra*, 78). Since Mongol tradition makes the shaman Kōkōčü play an important part in the attribution of the name « Činggis » to Chinghiz-khan, BARTHOLD supposed that this was « the name of one of the