

spirits to whom the shamans paid reverence » (*ZVOIRAO*, x, 116), and he mentioned BANZAROV's «*Ḥajir Činggis tängri*». This is also the view taken by VLADIMIROV. I do not feel inclined to accept it without some qualification. Of course, it is difficult to discuss a name occurring in unknown conditions in a manuscript of unknown date and origin. But it may be a prejudiced view to give to Kōkōčü, on the authority of Rašidu-'d-Din, an importance in the ceremony of the enthronement which is not countenanced by any other source. At any rate, the very name of the shamanist god seems to betray a non-Mongolian origin. *Tängri*, «Heaven» and «God», is common to both Turkish and Mongolian; but *ḥajir* < *qajir* is the form taken by the Turkish *qadir*, «powerful», «terrible», when it was borrowed from Turkish into Mongolian (cf. *TP*, 1930, 53). Even if there be a connection with the title adopted by Chinghiz-khan, we may explain «*Ḥajir Činggis tängri*» as being originally the name of a Turkish shamanist god, **Qadir Tängiz tängri*, «the Powerful God Ocean». The etymology of «*Činggis*» would remain the same.

In Mongolian, Chinghiz-khan is never called simply «*Činggis*», but always «*Činggis-ḥan*» or «*Činggis-qa'an*». In F, despite some exceptions, «Cinghis can» is generally given in the text, but «Cinghis kaan» in the table of contents and in the titles of chapters; on the other hand, «kaan» occurs even in the text when Polo speaks of Qubilai. YULE adopted «Chinghis Kaan» throughout his edition; the present one gives «Cinghis Kan». Without being too positive, it looks as though Polo had distinguished «can» or «kan» = *ḥan*, «khan», and «kaan» = *qa'an*; the forms «Cinghis kaan» in the table of contents and in the titles of chapters would be the result of a mistaken normalization. Whatever the case may be with Polo himself, the distinction actually existed; the relation and the respective values of *ḥan* and *qa'an* will be discussed under «Kaan». Among mediaeval travellers, Plan Carpine and Rubrouck give to Chinghiz-khan the title of «chan» = khan; Marignolli alone speaks of «Cingwis caam» (*Wy*, 543), which probably renders «*Činggis-qa'an*». Rašidu-'d-Din devotes chapters to «*Čingiz-ḥan*», «*Ögötai-ḥan*», «*Ĵöči-ḥan*», «*Čayatai-ḥan*», «*Tului-ḥan*», «*Güyük-ḥan*», and «*Mongka-ḥan*», but to «*Qubilai-qaan*». The first to take the title of *qa'an* was Ögötai, and this as a sort of personal epithet, which was even at a later date a sufficient designation of him as *qa'an-ḥan* (see «Kaan»). It was only Qubilai who took on the title of the great *qa'an* as a mere epithet, and was spoken of as *Qubilai-qa'an*. It may be objected that the *Secret History* always speaks of «*Činggis-qa'an*», and even applies the title of *qa'an* to the sovereigns of the first short-lived Mongol Empire which preceded that of Chinghiz-khan, «*Qabul-qa'an*», «*Qutula-qa'an*». All this must be due to later tradition, when *qa'an* had replaced *ḥan* in Mongol usage, and is ascribable either to the compilers of the *Secret History* in 1240, or more probably to later copyists. We have irrefutable proof, however, that Chinghiz-khan did not take the title of *qa'an*. The so-called «stone of Chinghiz-khan» preserved in Leningrad begins with the words *Činggis qan-i* (or *Činggiz qan-i*?; cf. *supra*), a popular genitive of «*Činggis-qan*»; *qan* is the regular notation of *ḥan* in Uighur script, because this, like the later Uighur-Mongolian script, had no special letter for *ḥ*. This was still the case in Güyük's time. We have already seen that, in his letter of 1246 addressed to Innocent IV, he styles himself in Turkish *talui-nung ḥan*, and in his Mongol seal *dalai-in qanu* (genitive), *i. e.* both times *ḥan*, not *qa'an*. When Malakia, in the 13th cent., speaks of «*Čang'iz-γayan*» = *Činggis-qa'an*, it was already the result of the same change of habit which altered *Činggis-qan* to