

CENTRAL ASIATIC JOURNAL

EDITED BY
LARS PETER LAAMANN

59 (2016) 1/2

MIGRATION AND NATION-
BUILDING IN CENTRAL AND
WESTERN ASIA: TURKIC PEOPLES
AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS (I)

HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG · WIESBADEN

Editorial Board

Editor

Lars Peter Laamann (SOAS, University of London), LL10@soas.ac.uk

Editorial Board Members

Nathan W. Hill (SOAS, University of London)

Ron Sela (Indiana University)

Agata Bareja-Starzyńska (University of Warsaw)

Wang Tao (Sothebys)

Aleksandr Naymark (Hofstra University)

Pamela Kyle Crossley (Dartmouth University)

Publisher

Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Germany

Subscriptions and access to electronic format

Please contact verlag@harrassowitz.de for queries concerning subscription rates and modalities. The *Central Asiatic Journal* can also be accessed electronically via JSTOR (www.jstor.org).

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2016

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Layout and typesetting: Petra Himstedt-Vaid, M. A.

Printing and binding by ⊕ Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

ISSN 0008-9192

Foreword

Istanbul in the 1990s was a heady mix of aspirations. As the most potent symbol of Turkish influence in history, the city had suddenly become home to an exodus of ethnic cousins from former Soviet republics. Eager to find an alternative identity to being the keepers of the lost Ottoman empire, many Turks rediscovered over night that their language, in all its variants, could be heard from the Bosphorus to Beijing. Fluttering flags from the “Turkic” republics and entities stretching across the entire Eurasian land mass were vivid reminders that this country at so many crossroads had a new venue to explore, further to Europe and “the West”, namely that of a commonwealth of ethnically akin nations. Alas, the political events of the following two decades put paid to this, chiefly the rise of Islamism and the growing influence of Russia in the former Soviet south. Furthermore, the definition of Turkic identity was all but self-evident, both in its genesis and its historical development. Importantly, no Turkic community ever existed in isolation, always exposed to the trade-diplomacy and martial ambitions of neighbouring ethnic groups. What ethnonyms such as ‘Turk’ / ‘Türk’ and ‘Mongol’ entailed in historical terms is precisely the purpose of the present edition of the *Central Asiatic Journal*. Due to its sheer size, the contributions had to be spread over four issues, i.e. volumes no. 59 and 60, all articles distributed in order to provide for thematic and chronological cohesion.

The present volume starts off with an ethno-linguistic attempt at defining early interpretations of the peoples of the steppe – Mongols as much as Turks. While Li Yong-Söng’s analysis of the names allocated to fingers in Turkic languages establishes a web of common linguistic denominators, Denis Ramseyer’s study of the early archaeological site of Boroo Gol takes us back to the shared beginnings of steppe civilisation. György Kara then takes us forward in time to the blossoming of Tibetan Buddhism in Inner Asia, based on a printed fragment discovered at Qaraqota. The next three contributions all focus on the development of the historical empires emanating from the steppe during the “Mongol period”. Andreas Wilde and Nigora Allaeva analyse the military ambitions of Nādir Shāh, with momentous implications for all ethnic entities involved. Joo-Yup Lee enters this volume’s core theme by investigating the changing essence of Turkic identity in central Asia, while Ho Kai-lung does the same for the official titles of the Yuan and Ming periods. The next two articles propel into the eighteenth century, with Kicenge (*alias* 承志; an English translation of this article will be available in volume 60) writing on the puzzle of ethnicities as presented in the (Qing 清) ‘Ula map’ and Wolfgang Scharlipp elaborating the lexicographic methodology behind the Turkic terms printed in the Qing Pentaglot Dictionary (五體清文鑑 / *بش قسمی قوشقان خت*). Our last couple of entries deal with two Western academics who in the nineteenth century explored the past of a region by then being “opened up” to the West. Paul M. Taylor provides

intriguing insight into William Luis Abbott's expedition to Turkestan during the 1890s, while Michael Knüppel presents our readers with letters by Julius von Stubendorff, who in the middle of the nineteenth century undertook ethnographic studies of central and east Siberian populations at the bequest of the Russian tsar.

To summarise and in anticipation of the present volume's sequel, the multi-ethnic societies in today's world are far from exceptional phenomena, rather than logical developments of historical constants; so are, of course, exclusivist populisms, fanaticism and pogroms. The fate of the states and empires which witnessed the latter may serve as a useful exhortation to today's earthlings towards integration and coexistence.

L. P. Laamann, July 2016

Contents

Disclaimer and Apology by the Publisher	VII
Abstracts	IX
Contributions	
LI Yong-Söng 李容成 이용성 Finger Names in Modern Turkic Languages	1
György KARA Reading the Middle Mongol Translation of 'Phags-pa's <i>Shes-bya rab-gsal</i> in the St. Petersburg Manuscript and in a Print Fragment from Qaraqota	43
Denis RAMSEYER Role and Function of the Site of Boroo Gol (Töv, Mongolia)	61
Andreas WILDE & Nigora ALLAEVA Lost in Khvārazm. On the Interdependence of Power and Conflict in the Example of Nādir Shāh's Khīva Campaign(s)	77
Joo-Yup LEE The Historical Meaning of the Term <i>Turk</i> and the Nature of the Turkic Identity of the Chinggisid and Timurid Elites in Post-Mongol Central Asia	101
HO Kai-lung 何啟龍 The Office and Noble Titles of the Mongols from the 14 th to 16 th century, and the study of the "White History" <i>Čayan Teüke</i>	133
承志 滿文《烏喇等處地方圖》考	179
Wolfgang SCHARLIPP Zu einigen Bearbeitungsmethoden lexikalischer Einträge und deren türkische Ergebnisse im manjurischen Fünfsprachenspiegel	239

Paul Michael TAYLOR Smithsonian Naturalist William Louis Abbott's Turkestan Expedition of 1893 and 1894	255
Michael KNÜPPEL Wer war Julius von Stubendorff?	275
Book reviews	
Arakawa, Shintarō 荒川 慎太郎, <i>Seikabun kongōkyō no kenkyū</i> 西夏文金剛 經の研究 (Marc MIYAKE)	285
Takeuchi, Tsuguhito 武内紹人 and Iuchi, Maho 井内真帆, <i>Tibetan texts from Khara-Khoto in the Stein Collection of the British Library</i> (Kirill SOLONIN)	289
Tsai Suey-Ling and Sun Hua (eds), <i>Buddhist Stone Sutras in China: Sichuan Province, Volume Two</i> Wang Yongbo and Claudia Wetzel (eds), <i>Buddhist Stone Sutras in China: Shandong Province, Volume Two</i> (Timothy H. BARRETT)	292
Karlheinz Schweitzer, <i>Johann Jählig und seine Zeit – Ein Büdinger forscht bei den Mongolen</i> (Michael KNÜPPEL)	294
Mándoky Kongur, István, <i>Kunok és magyarok</i> , vol. 1 (György KARA)	296
Gimm, Martin, <i>Ein Monat im Privatleben des Chinesischen Kaisers Kangxi: Gao Shiqis Tagebuch Pengshan Miji aus dem Jahre 1703</i> (Lars P. LAAMANN)	298
Pang, Tatjana A.; Sary, Giovanni: <i>Manchu versus Ming. Qing Taizu Nurhacis' „Proclamation” to the Ming Dynasty</i> (Michael KNÜPPEL)	301
Publication Note	302

The Historical Meaning of the Term *Turk* and the Nature of the Turkic Identity of the Chinggisid and Timurid Elites in Post-Mongol Central Asia

Joo-Yup Lee

University of Toronto

Introduction

Prior to embarking on a military campaign against the Khwārazm Shāh Dynasty in retaliation for the murder of his envoys, Chinggis Khan went to a hill and prayed for help from God. According to the *Jāmi' al-tavārikh*, a universal history compiled for the Mongol rulers in Iran by Rashīd al-Dīn Faẓlallāh Hamadānī (d. 1318), Chinggis Khan addressed his God as “the Creator of Tajik and Turk” (*āfarīnanda-i Tāzhīk u Turk*).¹ While it is unlikely Chinggis Khan himself would have used such a phrase, it is true that the Mongols are referred to as *Turks* in other contemporary sources as well. For instance, when a descendant of Chinggis Khan, Abū al-Ghāzī Bahadur Khan (r. 1644–63), the ruler of the ‘Arabshāhid Dynasty in Khiva, composed a history of the Chinggisids and the Mongols, he named it *Šejere-i Türk*, or Genealogy of the Turks. As the title itself shows, the Mongols are designated as Turks in the *Šejere-i Türk*. Unlike Rashīd al-Dīn and Abū al-Ghāzī Bahadur Khan, modern historians only refer to the Turkic-speaking peoples as Turks. And some also interpret literally the term *Turk* that appears in sources as denoting Turkic-speaking groups.² However, Middle Eastern historians and Central Asianists are also aware that *Turk*

1 See Rashīd al-Dīn Faẓlallāh Hamadānī, *Jāmi' al-tavārikh*, ed. Bahman Karīmī (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Iqbāl, 1367/1988), 1: 344; Rashiduddin Fazlullah, *Jami' u' t-tawarikh (Compendium of Chronicles): A History of the Mongols*, trans. W. M. Thackston, 3 pts. ([Cambridge, Mass.]: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1998–99), 1: 235.

2 For instance, Isenbike Togan interprets the term *Turk* applied to the Mongols by Rashīd al-Dīn in the *Jāmi' al-tavārikh* literally. Discussing the origin of the Qunghrat tribe, she translates *atrāk-i mughūl*, which should be rendered as “the Mongol Turks” and understood as the Mongol branch of Inner Asian nomads as will be discussed below, as “Turks of the Mongols” or “Turks living among the Mongols” or “Mongolised Turks”. Togan thus views the Qunghrat as Turks even though Rashīd al-Dīn clearly includes them among the original Mongol tribes. See Isenbike Togan, “The Qongrat in History”, in *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, ed. Judith Pfeiffer and Sholeh A. Quinn (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 66. For *atrāk-i mughūl* and the Qunghrat, see Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tavārikh*, 1: 112; Thackston, *Jami' u' t-tawarikh*, 1: 79.

was often used as a generic term meaning all Inner Asian nomads in medieval Islamic sources. M. A. Shaban, most notably, argues that the term *Turk* was used in a very loose manner in Muslim sources and encompassed non-Turkic-speaking tribes and peoples as well. He thus warns us that *Turk* should not be understood in the modern sense of the term.³

The apparent discrepancy between the medieval Islamic understanding of *Turk* and the modern scholarly usage of the term as a synonym for Turkic-speaking peoples has earlier been discussed in detail by Ney Elias, a late nineteenth-century historian. In his introduction to the English translation of the mid-sixteenth-century *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī*, a history of the khans and Dughlāt *amīrs* of the Moghul Khanate, Elias explains that *Turk* had a dual meaning in medieval Muslim writings: *Turk* denoted Turkic peoples in the “ethnological” sense on the one side and all Inner Asian nomads of the steppes in the “sociological” sense on the other side. In the latter meaning, *Turk* was synonymous with the word nomad, irrespective of origin. Elias argues that *Turk*, when applied to the Mongols by Muslim writers, should be understood only in the second sociological sense, meaning all Inner Asian nomads.⁴ However, Muslim writers, including Rashīd al-Dīn and Abū al-Ghāzī Bahadur Khan, used *Turk* also in “ethnological” sense, to use Elias’ term, when they applied it to the Mongols as I will discuss below.

This article is devoted to an examination of the historical meaning of the term *Turk* and the nature of the Turkic identity of the Chinggisid and Timurid elites in post-Mongol Central Asia. More specifically, I will carry out a wide-ranging study of the historical usage of the term *Turk* in order to explain why and in what sense the Mongols and their descendants in Islamic Central Asia designated themselves as *Turks*, a question that has not been thoroughly dealt with by historians.

I will first examine the meaning of the term *Turk* (*Türk* in Turkic) that was used in eastern Inner Asia and China following the rise of the Kōk Türks in the mid-sixth century CE. I will demonstrate that *Turk* was reserved for the Kōk Türks and related tribes and that other Turkic-speaking tribes were not identified with the Kōk Türks. I will also show that the term *Turk* accordingly lost its currency in eastern Inner Asia and China during the Mongol and post-Mongol periods. Second, I will examine the usage of the term *Turk* in the Islamic world. I will demonstrate that *Turk* was more often used as a generic term denoting all Inner Asian nomads in Islamdom. I will also explain that medieval Muslim writers generally viewed Inner Asian tribes, whom they collectively called *Turks*, as belonging to a single entity, regardless of their linguistic affiliation. Third, I will examine tribal formation and identity in the

3 M. A. Shaban, *Islamic History: A New Interpretation*, vol. 2, A.D. 750–1055 (A.H. 132–448) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 63.

4 See N. Elias, introduction to *A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia Being the Tarikh-i Rashidi of Mirza Haidar, Dughlat*. An English Version Edited, with Commentary, Notes, and Map by N. Elias. The Translation by E. Denison Ross, by Mirzā Muḥammad Ḥaidar Dughlāt (London: Sampson Low, Marston, 1895; repr., London: Curzon, 1972), 78–98.

Inner Asian nomadic world. I will demonstrate that Inner Asian nomadic peoples were usually made up of tribes of different linguistic backgrounds and that the potential development of a common identity or loyalty was not contingent upon linguistic relatedness. I therefore argue that medieval Chinese historians and Muslim writers, with appropriate reason, did not classify Inner Asian tribes into Turkic-speaking and non-Turkic-speaking groups. Finally, I will discuss in detail the meaning of *Turk* used in Chinggisid and Timurid sources produced in Central Asia and Iran during the Mongol and post-Mongol periods. I will first demonstrate that Chinggisid and Timurid historians used *Turk* as a term relational to *Tajik*, meaning the sedentary Iranian population, not as an antonym of *Mongol*. I will then demonstrate that the Chinggisid and Timurid dynastic genealogies that described the Mongols as belonging to the noblest branch of Turks were a unique expression of pride in the Chinggisid heritage, not an indication of Turkicisation.

The Meaning of the Term *Turk* in Eastern Inner Asia and China

The designation *Turk* (*Türk* in Turkic) came into existence with the emergence of the Kök Türks, who established the First Türk Kaganate in the mid-sixth century CE. *Turk* then had a narrow meaning, which only encompassed the nucleus of the Türk Khaganates. The Kök Türks used it as a self-appellation, not as a term denoting all the Turkic-speaking nomads. For instance, in the Orkhon inscriptions, only the core group of the Türk Khaganates is called *Türks*, whereas other Turkic-speaking peoples such as the Toquz Oghuz, Qirghiz, Tarduš and Tölis are called by their respective names.⁵

Naturally, the name *Turk* was not used as a self-appellation by other Turkic nomadic peoples, including the Uighurs, who replaced the Kök Türks on the Mongolian Plateau in the mid-eighth century.⁶ In their official inscriptions, the Uighurs call themselves *Uighur* (*Uyğur*) and use the term *Turk* (*Türük*) only to refer to the Kök Türks, whom they consider to be their enemies and oppressors.⁷ For instance, in the Taryat (Terkhin) inscription, the Uighur khan, El Etmiş Bilgä, states: “when I was twenty-eight, in the year of the serpent, I so dispersed the Türk *el* and so destroyed

5 See the lines 11–14 (east side) of the Kül Tegin inscription translated in Kemal Silay, ed., *An Anthology of Turkish Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1996), 4.

6 Peter Golden maintains that the name *Turk* continued to be used by the Uighurs to refer to the Turkic peoples and the Turkic literary language after the demise of the Second Türk Khaganate. However, without discussing the usage of the term *Turk* in the Uighur inscriptions, he presents as evidences some works produced by the Qocho Uighurs such as an eleventh-century Uighur translation of the Chinese biography of Xuanzang. See Peter B. Golden, “Some Thoughts on the Origins of the Turks and the Shaping of the Turkic Peoples”, in *Contact and Exchange in the Ancient World*, ed. Victor H. Mair (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006), 145.

7 Therefore, Michael R. Drompp argues that the Uighur Kaganate cannot be regarded as a “third Türk empire”. See Michael R. Drompp, *Tang China and the Collapse of the Uighur Empire: A Documentary History* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 23.

them”.⁸ His words recorded in the Moyun Čor (Šine-Usu) inscription also illustrate the separateness of the two groups:

I heard that Özmiš Tegin had become *qan* (of the Tūrüks). In the Sheep Year (A.D. 743), I marched (with my army) ... I seized (Özmiš Qayan) ... Thereafter the Tūrük people has ceased to exist.⁹

In line with the Inner Asian practice of reserving the term *Turk* for the Kök Türks, medieval Chinese historians also employed the term *Turk* (*Tujue* in Chinese) only for the Kök Türks and called other Turkic-speaking tribes such as the Tiele, Uighurs, and Qirghiz by their own names in the official Chinese dynastic histories.¹⁰ For instance, the *Jiu Tangshu* [Old Tang History] records that “after the Tujue became powerful, the Tiele gradually became dispersed and small”.¹¹ Similarly, the Uighurs, a former member of the Tiele tribal union, are not called *Tujue* in the official Chinese dynastic histories. Whereas the Shatuo tribe, which actually descends from the Chuyue tribe of the Western Türks,¹² is referred to as “a separate tribe of the Western Tujue” in the *Xin Tangshu* [New Tang History],¹³ no such mention is made regarding the origin of the Uighurs.¹⁴

8 See Talat Tekin, “The Tariat (Terkhin) Inscription”, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 37 (1983): 46 (text), 49 (trans.).

9 See the lines 9–10 (north side) of the Šine-Usu inscription. T. Moriyasu, K. Suzuki, S. Saito, T. Tamura, and Bai Yudong, “Shineusu hibun yakuchu [Šine-Usu Inscription: Translation and Commentaries]”, *Nairiku Ajia gengo no kenkyu* [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages] 24 (2009): 11 (text), 24 (trans.).

10 Medieval Chinese historians refer to some obscure tribes as *Tujue*, i.e., Kök Türk. These include such tribes as the *Muma Tujue* 木馬突厥 [Wooden horse Türk], the *Xianyu Tujue* 鮮于突厥, and the *Niuti Tujue* 牛蹄突厥 [Ox-hoof Türk], who resided to the east of the Qirghiz. It is not clear whether or not all of the obscure *Tujue* tribes were splinter groups of the Kök Türks. For the *Muma Tujue*, see Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 and Song Qi 宋祁, *Xin Tangshu* 新唐書 [New Tang History] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 217b.6148. For the *Xianyu Tujue* and *Niuti Tujue*, see Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修, *Xin Wudaishi* 新五代史 [New history of the Five Dynasties] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 73.907. Denis Sinor gives detailed information on such *Tujue* tribes and suggests that they were Kök Türks “living outside the [Kök] Türk state” or “[not belonging] to the ruling stratum of the Türk state”. See Denis Sinor, “Some Components of the Civilization of the Türks (6th to 8th Century A.D.)”, in *Altaistic Studies. Papers Presented at the 25th Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference at Uppsala June 7–11, 1982*, ed. Gunnar Jarring and Steffan Rosén (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1985), 152–57.

11 Liu Xu 劉昫, *Jiu Tangshu* 舊唐書 [Old Tang History] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002), 199b.5343. For the Türk, see Wei Zheng 魏徵, *Suishu* 隋書 [Sui Dynasty Documents] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008), 84.1863–79; *Jiu Tangshu* 194a–b; Li Yanshou 李延壽, *Beishi* 北史 [History of the Northern Dynasties] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 99.3285–302. For the Tiele, see *Suishu* 84.1879–80; *Jiu Tangshu* 199b.5343–49; *Beishi*, 99.3303–4.

12 The Tang histories list the Chuyue among the tribes of the Western Türks. See *Jiu Tangshu*, 194b.5179; *Xin Tangshu*, 215b.6055.

13 *Xin Tangshu*, 218.6153.

14 *Xin Tangshu*, 217a.6111.

As a matter of fact, medieval Chinese historians neither viewed all the Turkic tribes as forming a single nomadic entity nor clearly differentiated them from the Mongolic or Para-Mongolic tribes. This is well exemplified in the medieval Chinese practice of attributing the origins of specific nomadic tribes to their predecessors in the Mongolian steppes. In the official Chinese dynastic histories, the Kōk Türks, Tiele, and Uighurs, all of whom are Turkic-speaking groups, are mostly classified as being of Xiongnu origin,¹⁵ while the Khitan and the Qay, who were Para-Mongolic-speaking tribes, are classified as being of Dong Hu (“Eastern Barbarian”) origin.¹⁶ However, medieval Chinese historians also ascribe the origin of the Kōk Türks to the obscure Suo state located to the north of the Xiongnu,¹⁷ or to the mixed barbarians (*Za hu*) of the Pingliang (in present-day Gansu Province).¹⁸ The Tiele (Gaoche) are also recorded as the remnants of the Chidi, a pre-Xiongnu northern tribe, in the *Weishu* [Wei History].¹⁹ Furthermore, even the Khitan and the Qay are classified as being of Xiongnu origin in some Chinese dynastic histories.²⁰ Not surprisingly, the *Xin Tangshu* even associates the Shiwei, who are considered the progenitors of the Mongols, with the Turkic Dingling (Tiele) tribe.²¹

The medieval Chinese practice of not differentiating between Turkic and non-Turkic tribes is also reflected in the use of the term *Tatar* (*Dada*) as a collective term denoting the nomads of the Mongolian steppes on the eve of the Mongol conquests. In the *Mengda beilu*, written by Zhao Gong, the Southern Song envoy to the Mongols, the Tatars are classified into three branches: the Black Tatar, White Tatar, and Wild Tatar. The Black Tatar (*Hei Dada*) denoted the Mongols while the White Tatar (*Bai Dada*) referred to the Turkic Önggüt tribe.²² That is, the term *Tatar* encompassed the Mongols, a Turkic tribe, as well as an obscure tribe.

Among the ancient Tibetan manuscripts discovered by Paul Pelliot, there is a roll, which contains a report submitted to a Uighur ruler by five men, who were sent to reconnoitre the northern lands. This report allows us to examine the Tibetan view of the Inner Asian tribes as the original Uighur report was edited by a Tibetan

15 For the Türk and the Tiele, see *Beishi*, 99.3285, 3303. For the Uighur, see *Jiu Tangshu*, 195.5195; *Xin Tangshu*, 217a.6111.

16 For the Qay, see *Suishu*, 84.1881; *Xin Tangshu*, 219.6173. For the Khitan, see *Xin Tangshu* 219.6167.

17 Linghu Defen 令狐德芬, *Zhoushu* 周書 [Zhou History] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 50.908.

18 *Suishu*, 84.1863.

19 Wei Shou 魏收, *Weishu* 魏書 [Wei History] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 103.2307.

20 For the Qay, see *Jiu Tangshu* 199b.5354; *Xin Wudaishi*, 74.909. For the Khitan, see Xue Juzheng 薛居正, *Jiu Wudaishi* 舊五代史 [Old history of the Five Dynasties] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 137.1827.

21 *Xin Tangshu*, 219.6176.

22 Zhao Gong, *Men-da bey-lu: Polnoye opisaniye mongolo-tatar*, trans. N. Ts. Munkuyev (Moskva: Nauka, 1975), 243–46 (text), 45–48 (trans.); Haenisch, Erich, Yao Ts'ung-wu, Peter Olbricht, and Elisabeth Pinks, eds., *Meng-ta Pei-lu und Hei-ta Shih-lüeh: Chinesische Gesandtenberichte über die frühen Mongolen 1221 und 1237* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980), 3–4.

writer.²³ In the list of the peoples visited by these envoys, several Inner Asian tribes are mentioned: the Qay (*He*), the Türk (*Drugu*), the Khitan (*Ge-tan*), the Qirghiz (*Gir-tis*), the Uighurs (*Hor/Ho-yo-hor*), the Qarluq (*Gar-log*), among others.²⁴ Unlike the Chinese dynastic histories or the Turkic inscriptions, this report also uses the term *Drugu* for some non-Kök Türk tribes. For instance, *Drugu* is used to refer to the Tiele tribes, to which the Uighur royal clan formerly belonged.²⁵ However, *Drugu* was not a broad term that encompassed all the Turkic-speaking tribes. The Kök Türks and other Turkic tribes such as the Pecheneg (*Be-ča-nag*), Qirghiz (*Gir-tis*), and Türgiř (*Du-rgyus*) are not collectively called *Drugu* in this report. Furthermore, *Drugu* was also used in Tibetan literary texts to designate the Tuyuhun, a Para-Mongolic nomadic people that dominated the northeastern part of the Tibetan Plateau between the fourth and seventh centuries CE.²⁶ Interestingly, the Tibetans later applied the term *Hor* (Uighur) to the Yuan Mongols.²⁷ These examples indicate that the Tibetan writers, like the medieval Chinese historians, did not classify all the Turkic-speaking tribes into a separate entity. Nor did they distinguish between the Turkic-speaking tribes and the Mongolic-speaking tribes.

When Chinggis Khan founded a new nomadic state in 1206, he incorporated into it several Turkic nomadic khanates and tribes such as the Naiman, Önggüt, Qirghiz, and Uighurs. However, the *Secret History of the Mongols*, the most important source for the early Mongols and Chinggis Khan, does not use the term *Türk* to denote these Turkic tribes.²⁸ In this work, the Turkic tribes such as the Qipchaq (*Kibča'ud*) and Qanqli (*Qanglin*) that were later subdued by the Mongols are not referred to as *Turks* either.²⁹ Evidently, the term *Türk* had fallen out of use in the Mongolian

23 Louis Ligeti, "À propos du Rapport sur les rois demeurant dans le Nord", in *Études Tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, ed. Marcelle Lalou, 166–89 (Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1971), 172.

24 Gérard Clauson, "À propos du manuscrit Pelliot tibétain 1283", *Journal Asiatique* 246 (1957–58): 11–36. For an English translation of this document, see Federica Venturi, "An Old Tibetan Document on the Uighurs: A New Translation and Interpretation", *Journal of Asian History* 42, no. 1 (2008): 19–32.

25 Clauson, "Manuscrit Pelliot Tibétain", 20. After the collapse of the second Türk Khaganate, the term *Drugu* came to denote the Uighurs. Ligeti, "Rapport sur les Rois", 174. I am inclined to think that *Drugu* was a name that mixed up the terms *Türk* and *Tiele*.

26 F. W. Thomas, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*, 4 vols. (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1935–55), 2: 278, 3: 76.

27 R. A. Stein, *Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet*, Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises 13 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959), 189.

28 The fact that the Mongols did not use the term *Türk* may indicate that this name was unknown among the Turkic Naiman, from whom the Mongols adopted their Uighur script. I am inclined to believe that the Naiman, who maintained close contact with the Qocho Uighurs, would have introduced the designation *Türk* to the Mongols had the Uighurs used it for themselves or the Naiman.

29 See Igor de Rachewiltz, trans., *The Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*. Translated with a Historical and Philosophical Commentary by Igor de Rachewiltz, 2 vols., Brill's Inner Asian Library 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 1:194.

stepped by the thirteenth century. The term *Turk* does not even appear in the *Secret History of the Mongols*.

The same holds true for the seventeenth-century Buddhist Mongolian chronicles such as the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* by Saghang Sechen and the *Altan Tobči* by Lubsangdanjin. These chronicles compiled in the Northern Yuan Dynasty do not use the term *Turk* to refer to any Turkic groups while employing the term *Toymay* to refer to the nomads of the Qipchaq Steppe and the Jochid Ulus.³⁰ The *Menggu Shixi Pu*, a Qing-era genealogy of the Northern Yuan Chinggisids, does not use the term *Turk* to denote the Turkic tribes either when providing the list of the tribes or kingdoms that Chinggis Khan conquered. Moreover, it does not distinguish the Turkic peoples such as the Qarluq, Naiman, and Uighur from other non-Turkic tribes such as the Mongolic Oyirat or the Manchurian Jurchen.³¹

In Mongol China, the ruling elites of non-Mongol origin were categorized as *semuren*, meaning “people of various categories”, by the Han Chinese officials. A list of the *semuren* tribes, along with that of the Mongol tribes, is provided in *Nancun Chuogeng Lu*, written by Tao Zongyi in 1366. In this list, no distinction is made between the Turkic tribes such as the Qipchaq and Qanqli and the non-Turkic *semuren* peoples such as the Tangut, As, and Rus'.³² As a matter of fact, even the Mongols (*Dada* 達達) are treated as *semuren*, along with the Uighurs, in a regulation recorded in the *Yuan Dianzhang*, the compendium of Yuan administrative law written in the early fourteenth century.³³ That is, the Yuan Chinese administrators did not categorise the Inner Asian tribes according to their linguistic affiliation.

The official histories produced in China during the post-Mongol period follow the same tradition. For instance, the *Mingshi* [Ming History], which contains a de-

30 For instance, in his *Erdeni-yin Tobči*, Saghang Sechen refers to the nomads of the Jochid Ulus during the reigns of Esen Taishi (r. 1439–55) and the Qazaq khan Haqq Nazar (r. 1538–80) as *Toymays* without distinction. See Saghang Sechen, *Erdeni-yin Tobci* ('Precious Summary'): *A Mongolian Chronicle of 1662*, ed. M. Gö, I. de Rachewiltz, J. R. Krueger, and B. Ulaan, vol. 1, *The Urga Text* (Canberra: The Australian National University, 1990), 113, 141, 142. Mentioning the names of the Jochid khans, Lubsangdanjin designates both the Uzbek khan Muḥammad Shībānī and the Qazaq khan Haqq Nazar as *Toymay*. See Lubsangdanjin, *Altan Tobči: eine mongolische Chronik des XVII. Jahrhunderts von Blo bzan bstan 'jin*, ed. Hans-Peter Vietze and Gendeng Lubsang (Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 1992), 90.

31 Lomi, *Mongyol Borjigid oboγ-un teūke. Meng-ku shih-hsi-p'ū*, ed. Walther Heissig and Charles R. Bawden (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957), 101–2 (6a–6b).

32 Tao Zongyi 陶宗儀, *Nancun Chuo Geng Lu* 南村輟耕錄 (Beijing: Zhonghua shu ju 1959), 12–14.

33 See *Yuan Dianzhang* 元典章 (Zhongguo shu dian, 1990), 8.9a–b. According to Funada Yoshiyuki, *semuren* was a purely Han Chinese terminology with no Mongolian equivalent, one that at times even included the Mongols. See Funada Yoshiyuki 船田善之, “Semuren yu yuan dai zhidu, shehui—chongxin tantao menggu, semu, hanren, nanren huafen de weizhi 色目人與元代製度、社會—重新探討蒙古、色目、漢人、南人劃分的位置 [Semu people and the system and society in the Yuan: re-examining the classification of the Mongols, Semu, Hanren and Nanren]”, *Yuanshi Luncong* 元史論叢 9 (2004): 163.

tailed account of the Northern Yuan Mongols and the Oyirats as well as a description of the Muslim Turkic peoples of Central Asia, neither uses the term *Turk* for the Turkic-speaking peoples nor differentiates the Turkic tribes from the Mongolic ones. The envoys and the merchants from the Timurids are merely referred to as *Huihui*, meaning Muslim, in the *Mingshi*.³⁴ Not surprisingly, the Turkic Qazaqs are referred to as *Dada huiyi* 韃靼回夷, meaning “Tatar Muslim barbarian,” in the *Ming shilu*, the imperial annals of the Ming Dynasty.³⁵ *Dada* 韃靼 was the name used to denote the Northern Yuan Mongols in the *Mingshi*.³⁶

In sum, a close examination of the Chinese, Tibetan, and, most importantly, native Inner Asian usages of the term *Turk* reveals that *Turk* was not used as a generic term for all Turkic tribes in eastern Inner Asia and China, and that it went out of use in the Mongolian steppes after the fall of the Kök Türks. Importantly, such usage of the term *Turk* and the absence of a collective term denoting all the Turkic-speaking tribes resulted from the fact that the identity of Inner Asian peoples was by no means determined by linguistic affiliation as will be discussed in detail below.

The Use of *Turk* as a Generic Term for Inner Asian Nomads in the Islamic World

Unlike in China and eastern Inner Asia, where the term *Turk* was principally used to designate the Kök Türks and related tribes, *Turk* acquired a much broader meaning in the Islamic world.³⁷ While medieval Muslim writers also used *Turk* in a narrow

34 Zhang Tingyu 張廷玉, *Mingshi* 明史 [History of the Ming Dynasty] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), 332.8598. Chen Cheng 陳誠, the Ming Chinese envoy, who visited the Timurid court in Herat in the early fifteenth century, does not use the term *Turk* when describing the states or inhabitants of Central Asia in his *Xiyu Xingcheng Ji* 西域行程記 [Record of the journey to the Western Regions]. Chen Cheng 陳誠 and Li Xian 李暹, *Xiyu Xingcheng Ji* 西域行程記 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1991).

35 See “Shizong shilu,” chapter 135 in the *Ming shilu* 明實錄 [The veritable records of the Ming], accessed July 15, 2016, <http://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=127034>.

36 For instance, the *Mingshi* relates “the *Dada* are Mongols, the descendants of the former Yuan.” See *Mingshi*, 327.8463.

37 V. V. Barthold ascribes the spread of the name *Turk* to Muslim authors. See V. V. Bartol’d, *Ocherk istorii turkmenskogo naroda*, in V. V. Bartol’d, *Sochineniya*, vol. 2, pt. 1, ed. B. G. Gafurov (Moscow: Nauka, 1963), 553–54. For an English translation, see V. V. Barthold, *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, trans. V. Minorsky and T. Minorsky, vol. 3, *Mir ‘Alī-Shīr. A History of the Turkman People* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), 83–84. Peter Golden, on the other hand, argues that the name *Turk* was used as a designation independently from Muslim usage by or for the Uighurs, the Khazars, and perhaps the Oghuz after the fall of the Türk Khaganate. See Peter Golden, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples: Ethnogenesis and State-Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1992), 115–16; Golden, “Some Thoughts on the Origins of the Turks”, 144–6. However, I suggest that the use of the term *Turk* in a broader sense by the Qocho Uighurs than by the Orkhon Uighurs was a practice probably influenced by the usage of *Turk* in the Perso-Islamic world. Concerning the Khazars, they appear as *Tujue Hesa* 突厥曷薩 in the *Xin Tangshu* as a people living to the northwest of Khorezm. See *Xin Tangshu*, 221b.6247. Golden himself views the Khazar dynasty as originating from the Ashina clan, the royal family of the

sense,³⁸ they tended to employ it as a generic term for all Inner Asian nomads who resided in the steppe north of the Syr Darya River, irrespective of their linguistic background.³⁹ For instance, Muslim geographers, such as Gardīzī and Marvazī, describe all the northern peoples, including some Finno-Ugrian and Slavic peoples, as *Turks*.⁴⁰ The eleventh-century Ziyarid ruler Kai Kā'ūs b. Iskandar also classifies most of the Inner Asian nomadic tribes as Turks, just as the Persian national epic, the *Shāh-nāma*, designates all the nomadic tribes residing north of the Amu Darya River, including the Iranian nomads, as Turanians.⁴¹ In his *Qābūs-nāma*, Kai Kā'ūs describes as Turks not only the Turkic tribes such as the Oghuz, Qipchaq, and Chigil, but also the non-Turkic tribes such as the Tibetans, Qay, and Tatar:

Amongst them the most ill-tempered are the Ghuzz and the Qipchāqs; the best-tempered and the most willing are the Khutanese, the Khallukhīs and the

Kök Türks, based on the *Hudūd al-'ālam*, which records that the Khazar ruler descends from Ansā. See Peter Golden, "Courts and Court Culture in the Proto-urban and Urban Developments among the pre-Chinggisid Turkic Peoples", in *Turko-Mongol Rulers, Cities and City Life*, ed. David Durand-Guédy (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 53. This may explain why the Khazars were called *Tujue Hesa* in the *Xin Tangshu*. As a matter of fact, Golden also acknowledges that *Turk* may not have been used by the Turkic tribes as a self-designation after the fall of the Kök Türks. He writes: "Nonetheless, it is not at all clear that [*Turk*] was used by the various Turkic-speaking peoples to denote themselves after the collapse of the Turks. Indeed, their tribal and confederational names figure prominently in the sources. Rather, the name Turk was most widely used by the Arabs and other neighboring peoples as a generic term to denote the largely Turkic-speaking Central Asian tribal, nomadic societies ..." See Peter B. Golden, "The Turks: Origins and Expansion", *Turks and Khazars: Origins, Institutions, and Interactions in Pre-Mongol Eurasia* (Farnham, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate/Variorum, 2010), 22.

- 38 For instance, Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī used *Turk* in both narrow and broad senses as will be discussed below. During the Mongol period, many Muslim writers used the term *Turk* and the terms *Moḡul* (*Mughūl* in Persian) and *Tatar* to refer to the Turkic groups, such as the Ottomans and Mamluks, and the Mongols, respectively, although they mostly viewed the Mongols as being a branch of Turks as will be discussed below. In post-Mongol Central Asia, most notably, Ḥāhīr al-Dīn Muḥammad Babur (r. 1526–30), the founder of the Mughal Empire, reserved *Turk* for the Turkic subjects of the Timurid polities in his *Bābur-nāma*. On occasions, however, Babur also used *Turk* in a broad sense, meaning "pastoral nomads". See Stephen F. Dale, *The Garden of the Eight Paradises: Babur and the Culture of Empire in Central Asia, Afghanistan and India (1483–1530)*, Brill's Inner Asian Library 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 158, 161.
- 39 Byzantine authors also used the term *Turk* (*Tourkoi*) loosely and designated the Magyars, a non-Turkic-speaking people, as Turks just as they anachronistically employed the term "Scythian" for non-Scythian nomadic tribes. Perhaps, the Muslim usage of the term *Turk* may have been influenced by Byzantine practice. For the Byzantine usage of the term *Tourkoi*, see Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. 2, *Sprachreste der Türkvolker in den Byzantinischen Quellen* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1958), 320–27.
- 40 See Sharaf al-Zamān Ṭāhir Marvazī on China, the Turks and India: Arabic text (circa A.D. 1120) with an English translation and commentary by V. Minorsky, trans. V. Minorsky (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1942), 29–36; A. P. Martinez, "Gardīzī's Two Chapters on the Turks", *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 2 (1982): 109–217.
- 41 Tadeusz Kowalski, "Les Turcs dans le *Shah-name*", *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 15 (1939–49): 89–90.

Tibetans; the boldest and the most courageous are the Turghay, the most injured to toil and hardship and the most active are the Tatars and the Yaghmā, whereas the laziest of all are the Chigil.⁴²

The great Qarakhanid philologist Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī (fl. c. 1075) provides a description of the Inner Asian nomadic tribes that reflects the influence of the Perso-Islamic traditions. In his *Dīwān Luḡāt al-Turk*, Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī uses the name *Turk* both in a narrow sense to refer to the Qarakhanids, whom he distinguishes from the Oghuz, and in a broader sense to denote not only the Turkic peoples such as the Oghuz and Qipchaq, but also the non-Turkic peoples such as the Tangut, Tatar, Khitan, and Qay.⁴³ Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī also identifies Alp Er Tonga, the legendary hero of the Turkic epics, with Afrāsiyāb, the Turanian hero of the *Shāh-nāma*.⁴⁴ Naturally, rather than tracing the origin of the Turks to the Kōk Türks or other historical Turkic peoples, Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī makes the Turks the descendants of a son of Japheth in accordance with the Islamic historical tradition,⁴⁵ which categorises peoples in terms of their supposed descent from Ham, Shem, and Japheth, the three sons of Noah:

The Turks are, in origin, twenty tribes. They all trace back to Turk, son of Japheth, son of Noah.⁴⁶

Mamluk historians also used the term *Turk* in a broad sense that included non-Turkic groups. For instance, although the majority of the Bahrī Mamluks belonged to the Qipchaq tribes, there were also other non-Turkic peoples such as the Qara Khitai (*Khitā'ī*), Mongols, and Oyirats in the Mamluk corps.⁴⁷ Mamluk chroniclers, how-

42 Kai Kā'ūs ibn Iskandar, *A Mirror for Princes: The Qābūs Nāma*, trans. Reuben Levy (London: Cresset, 1951), 103; Kai Kā'ūs ibn Iskandar, *The Naṣīḥāt-nāma*, Known as Qābūs-nāma, of Kai Kā'ūs b. Iskandar b. Qābūs b. Washmgīr [Qābūs-nāma], ed. Reuben Levy (London: Luzac, 1951), 63.

43 Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī, *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luḡāt at-Turk)*, ed. and trans. Robert Dankoff, in collaboration with James Kelly, 3 pts. ([Cambridge, MA: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University], 1982–1985), 1: 82–83. Although Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī points out that these tribes knew Turkic too, modern scholars do not classify them as Turks.

44 Kāshgharī, *Dīwān Luḡāt at-Turk*, 2: 225.

45 See Bartol'd, *Ocherk istorii turkmenskogo naroda*, 578–79.

46 Kāshgharī, *Dīwān Luḡāt at-Turk*, 1: 82.

47 See Linda Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan: The Career of Al-Manṣūr Qalāwūn and the Consolidation of Mamluk Rule in Egypt and Syria (678–689 A.H./1279–1290 A.D.)*, *Freiburger Islamstudien Band 18* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998), 191–92. The Turkic ghlāms of the Delhi Sultanate were composed of both Turkic and non-Turkic groups such as the Qara Khitai. See Peter Jackson, *The Delhi Sultanate: A Political and Military History* (Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), 62–63. For a discussion of Mongol elements in the early Delhi Sultanate, see Sunil Kumar, “The Ignored Elites: Turks, Mongols, and a Persian Secretarial Class in the Early Delhi Sultanate”, *Modern Asian Studies* 43, no. 1 (2009): 45–77.

ever, collectively referred to them as *Turks*.⁴⁸ It is noteworthy that the term *Tatar* designating the Mongols was also used as a synonym for the term *Turk*. David Ayalon ambiguously claims that *Tatar* came to be used as a synonym for *Turk* because the Mongol army was mainly composed of Turks.⁴⁹ However, since Muslim writers generally viewed various non-Turkic tribes as *Turks*, Mamluk historians were undoubtedly following Muslim usage. Hence, it is no wonder why a Mamluk historian even described the Mongol language as being “pure Turkish”.⁵⁰

Significantly, Muslim writers often depicted the Turks as possessing certain physical characteristics. For instance, Marvazī contrasts Turks, whom he describes as being “short, with small eyes, nostrils, and mouths”, with the North East Africans, whom he depicts as being “tall in stature, with large eyes, nostrils and corners of mouths ...”.⁵¹ Ṭabarī (d. 923) also depicts the Turks in a similar manner:

Noah begat three, each one of whom begat three: Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Shem begat the Arabs, Persians, and Byzantines, in all of whom there is good. Japheth begat the Turks, Slavs, Gog, and Magog, in none of whom there is good. Ham begat the Copts, Sudanese, and Berbers ... Ham begat all those who are black and curly-haired, while Japheth begat all those who are full-faced with small eyes, and Shem begat everyone who is handsome of face with beautiful hair.⁵²

48 According to David Ayalon, the term *Turk* embraced all the Mamluk groupings in the wide sense. David Ayalon, “Mamlūk: Military Slavery in Egypt and Syria”, in *Islam and the Abode of War: Military Slaves and Islamic Adversaries* (London: Variorum, 1994), 7.

49 Ayalon, “Mamlūk”, 8–9.

50 Donald P. Little, “Notes on Aitamiš, a Mongol Mamlūk”, in *History and Historiography of the Mamlūks* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1986), 395. It should be also noted that the Qipchaqs, who constituted a major proportion of the *mamlūks* in Islamic polities, were a heterogeneous group. A number of Qipchaq tribes or clans were Mongolic in origin. For instance, the Ölberli that rose into prominence in the Delhi Sultanate was a Mongolic clan. On the probable origin of the Ölberli, see Song Lian 宋濂., *Yuanshi* 元史 [Yuan History] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005), 128.3131. Both Peter Golden and Omeljan Pritsak support a Mongolic origin of the Ölberli clan. See Omeljan Pritsak, “The Polovcians and Rus”, *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 2 (1982): 336–39; Peter B. Golden, “Cumanica II: The Ölberli (Ölperli): The Fortunes and Misfortunes of an Inner Asian Nomadic Clan”, *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 4 (1988): 22. The Qay, Toqsoba, and Khitan clans that constituted the Qipchaqs were also Mongolic in origin. For more details, see Peter B., Golden, “Cumanica IV: The Tribes of the Cuman-Qipčaq”, *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 9 (1995–97): 99–122. There were also Iranian elements among the Qipchaqs. For this reason, Peter Golden regards the Qipchaqs as being “a microcosm of nomadic Eurasia”. See Golden, “Cumanica IV”, 122.

51 Marvazī, *Marvazī on China, the Turks and India*, 53–54, 156. An Arabic geographical manuscript states that the Uighurs (Toquz Oghuz), the people of China, and the Turks resembled each other in facial appearance. See Richard N. Frye, “A New Arabic Geographical Manuscript”, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 8 (1949): 92–93.

52 Ṭabarī, *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, vol. 2, *Prophets and Patriarchs*, trans. William M. Brinner (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987), 21.

In his *Qābūs-nāma*, Kai Kā'ūs also describes the Turks as possessing “a large head (*sar-i buzurg*), a broad face (*rūy-i pahn*), narrow eyes (*chashmhā-i tang*), and a flat nose (*bīnī-i pakhch*) and unpleasing lips and teeth (*lab va dandān na nīkū*)”.⁵³ Like Kai Kā'ūs, medieval Persian poets depicted the Turks as having a round face with narrow eyes and a minute mouth.⁵⁴ Such depictions indicate that Muslim writers tended to view the Turks as possessing Inner Asian physical traits.

A number of Muslim writers also noted such physical appearance or phenotype of the Turks when interpreting the etymology of *Turkmen*, a term that Muslim writers chiefly used to refer to the Turkic people known as the Oghuz, among whom the Seljuks and the early Ottomans were included, from medieval times.⁵⁵ Concerning its etymology, Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī explains that *Turkmen* originates from the designation attached to twenty two Oghuz men by Alexander the Great, who referred to them as “*Turk mānand*”, meaning “these look like Turks”.⁵⁶ Rashīd al-Dīn gives the following explanation regarding the origin of the Turkmens and the etymology of *Turkmen*:

The word Turcoman did not exist long ago, for all the tribes who dwelt in the wilderness and looked like Turks were called simply Turks, each tribe having its own particular epithet. When the Oghuz tribes left their own territory and went into Transoxiana and Iran and begat and multiplied, because of the climate their features gradually changed into those of Tajiks. Since they were not Tajiks, the Tajik peoples called them turkman, i.e. Turk-like (*Turk-mānand*).⁵⁷

Ḥāfīz Tanīsh Mīr Muḥammad Bukhārī (d. ca. 1549) also gives a similar explanation about the Turkmens in his *Sharaf-nāma-i shāhī*, or *‘Abdallāh-nāma*. He relates that after the Oghuz came to Transoxiana and Iran, their “Turkic face did not remain as it was” (*ṣūrat-i Turkāna-i ishān bar qarār-i khud namānd*).⁵⁸ Abū al-Ghāzī Bahadur Khan, the Chinggisid ruler of the Khiva Khanate, provides a more vivid explanation regarding the distinct physical traits of the Turkmens:

After five, six generations, they changed under the influence of the soil and water. Their chin started to become narrow, their eyes started to become

53 Kai Kā'ūs, *A Mirror for Princes*, 103; Kai Kā'ūs, *The Naṣīhāt-nāma*, 64.

54 See Annemarie Schimmel, *A Two-Colored Brocade: The Imagery of Persian Poetry* (London, 1992), 138. Nizāmi, Ḥāfīz, Rumi, Sanā'ī, among others, described the Turks as having narrow eyes (*tang chashm*). See Ali Doostzadeh and Siavash Lornejad, *On the Modern Politicization of the Persian Poet Nezami Ganjavi* (Yerevan: Caucasian Centre for Iranian Studies, 2012), 19 n76.

55 *Turkmen* was sometimes also applied to the Qarluqs. For the etymology of *Turkmen*, see *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, new ed., s.v. “Türkmen” (by Barbara Kellner-Heinkele).

56 Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī, *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects*, 2: 362–63.

57 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tavārikh*, 1: 35–36; Thackston, *Jami'u't-tawarikh*, 1: 31.

58 Ḥāfīz Tanīsh Bukhārī, *Sharaf-nama-ii shakhi: kniga shakhs koy slavy*, ed. and trans. M. A. Salakhetdinova (Moscow: Nauka, GRVL, 1983), fol. 17a (text), 1: 61 (trans.).

large, their faces started to become small, and their noses started to become big.⁵⁹

The explanation that *Turkmen* derives from “*Turk-mānand*” does not clarify the etymology of the term *Turkmen*, not to speak of the origin of the Turkmen. However, since *Turkmen* was often associated with the change in physiognomy of a group of Turks, it could be argued that the Turks were viewed as possessing East Asian phenotypic traits, especially in Central Asia during the Mongol and post-Mongol periods.⁶⁰ This means that non-Turkic nomadic groups, including the Mongols, could readily be categorised as “Turks” in the Islamic world. In sum, the term *Turk* was commonly used as a collective term denoting all Inner Asian nomads in the Islamic world. Muslim writers did not define Inner Asian tribes based on linguistic affiliation.

Identity and Tribal Formation in Inner Asia

The Muslim tradition of using *Turk* as a generic term and the East and Inner Asian practice of using it in a narrow sense seem to be irreconcilable with each other. However, it should be noted that both Muslim and Asian usages of *Turk* reflected the following characteristics of Inner Asian tribal formation and identity: First, in Inner Asia, nomadic confederations were often made up of tribes of diverse linguistic backgrounds. For instance, the ruling elite of the Tuoba Wei dynasty (386–534 CE) was made up of both Turkic and Mongolic groups. While migrating southward to northern China from their original abode in northeastern Mongolia, the Para-

59 Abu-l-Gazi, *Rodoslovnaia turkmen: Sochinenie Abu-l-Gazi khana khivinskogo*, ed. and trans. Andrei Nikolaevich Kononov (Moscow/Leningrad: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958), 42 (text), 57 (trans.); Ebülgazî Bahadır Han, *Şecere-i Terākime* (Istanbul: Tercüman, 1975), 57–58.

60 Whether the etymology of *Turkmen* is “*turk-mānand*” or not, it is true that the Oghuz were probably the most Iranised Turkic tribe in the Islamic world. Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī also records that “when the Oghuz mixed with the Persians they forgot many Turkic words and used Persian instead”. Maḥmūd al-Kāšgharī, *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects*, 1: 115. Barthold agrees with the view that the admixture with Iranian tribes was the reason for the Turkmen’s distinguishable appearance from other Turkic peoples. Bartol’d, *Ocherk istorii turkmenskogo naroda*, 551; S. G. Agadzhanov argues that the Turkmen were formed from the descendants of the Indo-European population who intermixed with Turkic peoples. S. G. Agadzhanov and A. Kar’ryev, “Some Basic Problems of the Ethnogenesis of the Turkmen”, in *The Nomadic Alternative: Modes and Models of Interaction in the African-Asian Deserts and Steppes*, ed. Wolfgang Weissleder (The Hague: Mouton, 1978), 171. According to recent Y-Chromosome DNA studies, the Turkmen of Iran and Uzbekistan possess a (relatively) high frequency of R1a1a (14.5% and 72.5%, respectively), the major Y-chromosome DNA haplogroup of the Bronze Age Indo-European pastoralists of Inner Asia. For the Turkmen of Golestan, Iran, see Table 1 in Viola Grugni et al., “Ancient Migratory Events in the Middle East: New Clues from the Y-Chromosome Variation of Modern Iranians”, *PLoS One* 7, no. 7 (2012): 7. For the Turkmen of Karakalpakia, Uzbekistan, see Supplementary Figure 1 in Patricia Balaesque et al., “Y-Chromosome Descent Clusters and Male Differential Reproductive Success: Young Lineage Expansions Dominate Asian Pastoral Nomadic Populations”, *European Journal of Human Genetics* 23 (2015): 1–10.

Mongolic Tuoba assimilated several Turkic Dingling (Tiele) tribes such as the Hegu (Qirghiz) and Yizhan.⁶¹ As a result, the Dingling elements constituted as much as a quarter of the Tuoba tribe.⁶²

The same holds true for the Khitans, a Para-Mongolic nomadic people, who established the Liao Dynasty that ruled over northern China and the Mongolian steppes during the tenth and eleventh centuries CE. The Khitan ruling elite also included Uighur clans such as the Xiao, which formed one of the two most important ruling clans of the Liao Dynasty.⁶³ The Uighurs among the Khitans were so numerous that there was a saying: “Half of the Khitans are Uighurs”.⁶⁴ The Shiwei, a Mongolic tribe from whom the Mongols descended, may also have incorporated some Uighur elements in the mid-eighth century. The *Jiu Tangshu* records that when the Uighur Khaganate was overrun by the Qirghiz, some of the Uighurs fled to the Shiwei, who divided them into seven groups and distributed them among its seven tribes.⁶⁵

The Mongol *ulus*, or people, newly created by Chinggis Khan in the early thirteenth century, was also a multi-linguistic entity. It was made up of the original Mongols, other Mongolic tribes such as the Tatar and Oyirat, and the Turkic tribes such as the Naiman and Önggüt. The anonymous author of the *Secret History of the Mongols* thus defines it as “the people of the felt-walled tents” (*sisgei to'urqatu ulus*).⁶⁶ The Mongols went on to incorporate other Turkic tribes, such as the Qanqli and Qipchaq, in the Qipchaq Steppe, with whom they formed several Chinggisid *uluses*.

Furthermore, just as the Chinggisid Uzbek and Qazaq *uluses* consisted of diverse tribes originating in the Qipchaq Steppe and the Mongolian Plateau, so did the Northern Yuan Mongols. The latter included many tribes of non-Mongol origins such as the Tangut, Qipchaq, and Asud (Alans). Queen Mandukhai (d. 1510), who overthrew Oyirat rule and reunited the Mongols, belonged to the Enggüd tribe, the

61 For the list of the Tuoba tribes, see *Weishu*, 113: 3005–14.

62 Duan Lianqin, *Dingling, Gaoche yu Tiele* [The Dingling, the Gaoche, and the Tiele] (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1988. Reprint, Shanghai: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe, 2006), 109–115.

63 The Khitan royal clan Yelü intermarried with this clan. See K. A. Wittfogel and Chia-Sheng Feng, *History of Chinese Society. Liao (907–1125)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1949), 191, 206. In the *Liaoshi*, the Xiao sub-clans, the Bali and Yishiji, are listed among the most important ruling clans of the Liao Dynasty. See Tuotuo 脫脫, *Liaoshi* 遼史 [Liao History] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003), 33.383–84.

64 Qian Boquan, “Hasakezude zuyuan he zuming hanyi yanjiu [A study of the origin of the Qazaqs and the meaning of the term Qazaq]”, *Journal of Xinjiang University* 34, no. 1 (2006): 84.

65 The Qirghiz recaptured these Uighurs after defeating the Shiwei. *Jiu Tangshu* 195: 5215. Whether or not some Uighurs remained among the Shiwei, it is reasonable to imagine that amalgamations of Mongolic and Turkic tribes were not uncommon in the Inner Asian nomadic world.

66 Rachewiltz, *The Secret History of the Mongols*, 2: 758.

Mongolised Önggüt.⁶⁷ Part of the appanage of Altan Khan (1508–82), who re-established Mongol domination over the Mongolian Plateau in the second half of the sixteenth century, was also based on the Enggüd tribe.⁶⁸ Naturally, the Khalkha tribe, which is the largest tribe in modern-day Mongolia, also includes several sub-tribes of non-Mongol origins such as the Asud (Alans), Tangut, Kharachin (partly Qipchaq), Enggüd (Önggüt), and Sartuul (Sart).⁶⁹ It should be noted that the intermixing of different tribes is an ongoing process in Inner Asia since the Turkic-speaking tribes of modern-day western Mongolia, such as the Khoton and Uriankhai, have recently become Mongolic.⁷⁰

Second, the Inner Asian nomadic tribes who shared a common linguistic affiliation did not necessarily develop a common group identity. The most notable example is the enmity between the Mongols and the Mongolic Oyrats. Just as the Uighurs had not shared a common identity with the Kök Türks after the collapse of the Second Türk Khaganate, the Oyrats retained a separate identity from the Mongols after the breakup of the Mongol Empire. Nor did the Northern Yuan Mongols view them as Mongols.⁷¹

The *Altan Tobči* describes the Oyrats and the Mongols as distinct peoples on several occasions:

Batula Čingsang and Ügeči Qasaγa, for the first time, took the Dörben Tümen Oirad and became enemies (i.e. of the Mongols). The whole rule of the Mongols was taken over by the Oirad, it is said.⁷²

At the same time, the linguistic differences between tribes did not prevent them from developing a common identity. For instance, the *Hou Hanshu* [History of the Later Han] records that, after the collapse of their imperial confederation, many Northern Xiongnu joined the Xianbei, instead of fleeing to the Southern Xiongnu:

The northern Shanyu fled, the Xianbei moved in and established themselves on that land. The remnants of the Xiongnu who stayed still numbered over

67 Lubsangdanjin, *Altan Tobči*, 107; Charles Bawden, trans., *The Mongolian Chronicle Altan Tobči: Text, Translation and Critical Notes*, Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen 5 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1955), 177.

68 See Junko Miyawaki 宮脇淳子, *Saigo no yūboku teikoku: Jūngarubu no kōbō* 最後の遊牧帝国: ジューンガル部の興亡 [The last nomadic empire: the rise and fall of the Junghars] (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1995), 129.

69 S. Badamhatan, *BNMAU-iin ugsaatnii züi boty 1: khalkhiin ugsaatnii züi* [The ethnography of the Mongolian People's Republic part 1: The ethnography of the Khalkhs] (Ulaanbaatar: Sinzlech Uchaany Akademi: 1987), 26–52.

70 Buyantyn Dashtseren, *The History and Culture of Mongolia* (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1997), 48–49.

71 For a detailed discussion on this topic, see Joo-Yup Lee, “Were the Historical Oirats “Western Mongols”?” *Études mongoles et sibériennes, centrasiatiques et tibétaines* 47 (2016) (in press).

72 Bawden, *Altan Tobči*, 70–71 (text); 159 (trans.); Lubsangdanjin, *Altan Tobči*, 99. Batula Čingsang is the grandfather of the Oyrat ruler Esen Taishi (r. 1439–55).

100,000 households. They all called themselves Xianbei. The Xianbei grew strong because of this.⁷³

Likewise, the Northern Yuan Mongols shared a common identity with their Islamised and Turkicised relatives of the Qipchaq Steppe. According to the *Erdeni-yin Tobči*, a Chinggisid prince and his Naiman retainer, fleeing the Oyirat ruler Esen Taishi (d. 1455), headed to the Qipchaq Steppe saying: “The Toymay khans, who are the descendants of Jochi, are our kindred (*töröl*)”.⁷⁴

Third, physical resemblance often played a more important role than linguistic relatedness in the development of a common identity among some groups of Inner Asian steppe origin. To explain this point, I will discuss the mutual perceptions of the Mongols, the Qipchaq Turkic nomads, and the Turkmens.

According to Ibn al-Athīr (1160–1233), the Qanqli (eastern Qipchaq) garrison of Samarqand serving the Khwārazm Shāh deserted to the Mongols saying: “We are of their stock (*naḥnu min jins ha’ūlā’i*). They will not kill us”.⁷⁵ Similarly, Jebe and Sübe’etei, the Mongol commanders campaigning in the Qipchaq Steppe, could take advantage of such common identity in order to break the alliance between the Qipchaqs and the Alans by sending the following message to the former: “We and you are of the same stock” (*naḥnu wa’antum jins wāḥid*).⁷⁶

The Mamluks’ attitude towards the Mongols attests to their feelings of affinity with the Mongols. Although the Mamluks, recruited chiefly among the Qipchaq nomads, refrained from intermarrying with the local population,⁷⁷ they did choose the Mongols as their marriage partners. For instance, all wives of Sulṭān Qalāwūn (r. 1279–90) were of Mongol origin.⁷⁸ Perhaps the Mamluk view of the closeness between the two groups can be found in the remarks of Sulṭān al-Nāṣir (r. 1293–1341, with two interruptions):

73 Fan Ye 范曄, *Hou Hanshu* 後漢書 [History of the Later Han] (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973), 90.2986. It is not known which language the Xiongnu spoke. However, the *Weishu* records that the Xiongnu and the Xianbei did not share a common language. See, *Weishu*, 103: 2304. Like the remnants of the Northern Xiongnu, some Oyirats converted to Islam and became Qazaqs after being defeated by the Manchus in order to avoid massacre. See Uradyn Erden Bulag, “Dark Quadrangle in Central Asia: Empires, Ethnogenesis, Scholars and Nation-States”, *Central Asian Survey* 13, no. 4 (1994): 470.

74 Saghang Sechen, *Erdeni-yin Tobci*, 113.

75 ‘Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr, *Al-Kāmil fī al-tārīkh*, ed. Carl Johan Tornberg, vol. 12 (Beirut: Dar Sader, 1966), 368.

76 Ibn al-Athīr, *Al-Kāmil*, 385; “mā va shumā yik ṭayifa va yik jinsīm”, in Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi‘ al-tavārīkh*, 1: 382; “bizning qarīndāšimiz turursiz”, in Aboul-Ghāzi Bēhādour Khān, *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatares*, trans. Petr I. Demaisons (St. Petersburg: 1871–1874; repr., Amsterdam: Philo, 1970), (text): 121.

77 According to David Ayalon, the descendents of the Mamluks retained pure Mamluk blood. David Ayalon, “The Muslim City and the Mamluk Military Aristocracy”, in *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2 (1968), 311–29, reprinted in idem, *Studies on the Mamlūks of Egypt (1250–1517)* (London: Variorum, 1977), 323.

78 Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan*, 117.

The only thing which diverted us from (handling) you was our fighting with the Tatars. Today, however, we are, thank God, at peace (with them). We and they are of the same stock (*nahnu wa-ıyyāhum min jins wāhid*), and none of us will desert the other.⁷⁹

In contrast, the Turkmens did not enjoy the same privilege as the Mongols in Mamluk Egypt. Whereas the Mongol refugees and prisoners were incorporated into the elite corps⁸⁰ and even produced a sultan,⁸¹ the Turkmens were given a lower status than the Mamluks and could hardly rise to high ranks.⁸² It is noteworthy that a few Turkmens who became Mamluks were referred to as *Rūmīs*.⁸³ The Ottomans were also called *Uthmāniyya*, *Rūm*, and *Turkmān*.⁸⁴

In Central Asia, the Qipchaq Turkic-speaking nomads in the Chinggisid *uluses* did not share a sense of common identity with the Oghuz Turkic-speaking Turkmens, whom they regarded as distinctly inferior to themselves.⁸⁵ In Khiva, for instance, the Uzbeks and the Turkmens remained as separate peoples down to the Russian conquest in the nineteenth century. A visitor to Khiva in the early nineteenth century records that the two groups did not intermix with each other because of their distinct origins.⁸⁶ In sum, in pre-modern Inner Asia, nomadic confederations were usually made up of tribes of different linguistic backgrounds. Significantly, linguistic similarity did not play an important role in the development of a common identity or loyalty. Therefore, the medieval Chinese historians who used the term *Turk* for the Kōk Türks and related tribes had no reason to apply it to other Turkic-speaking tribes, who did not call themselves Turks, or to create an equivalent term to refer to all Turkic-speaking tribes, who did not share a common identity. Similarly, the medieval Muslim writers who used *Turk* as a generic term did not have to apply *Turk* solely to the Turkic-speaking tribes or to differentiate the Inner Asian nomadic tribes based on their linguistic affiliation.

79 Aḥmad ibn Yahyā Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-‘Umari, *Al-Ta’rīf bi’l-Muṣṭalah al-Sharīf*, ed. Samīr al-Durūbī, vol. 1 (Karak: Mu’ta University, 1413/1992), 83. This translated passage is quoted from David Ayalon, “The Great Yasa of Chingiz Khan: A Reexamination”, *Studia Islamica* 33 (1971): 122.

80 See Northrup, *From Slave to Sultan*, 191.

81 Kitbughā (r. 1294–96), an Oyrat Mamluk, was sultan of the Mamluk state for a brief period.

82 David Ayalon, “The Auxiliary Forces of the Mamluk Sultanate”, *Der Islam* 65 (1988): 20.

83 Ayalon, “Mamlūk”, 9.

84 David Ayalon, “Bahrī Mamlūks, Burjī Mamlūks – Inadequate Names for the Two Reigns of the Mamlūk Sultanate”, *Tārīh* 1 (1990): 48.

85 Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*, vol. 2, *The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), 403; Beatrice F. Manz, “Historical Background”, in *Central Asia in Historical Perspective*, ed. Beatrice F. Manz (Oxford: Westview, 1994), 6.

86 Nikolay Murav’ov, *Journey to Khiva: Through the Turkoman Country* (London: Oguz, 1977), 138.

The Nature of the Turkic Identity of the Chinggisids and Timurids in Islamic Central Asia

Various Chinggisid and Timurid histories produced in Central Asia and Iran during the Mongol and post-Mongol periods employed the term *Turk* to designate the Mongols and the Chinggisids as will be discussed below. Before examining the meaning of the term *Turk* used in Chinggisid and Timurid histories in detail, I will first demonstrate that the Mongols were often described by Muslim writers as being a branch of Turks.

Ibn Baṭūṭah (1304–77), the Moroccan traveller who made an extensive tour around the Mongol states in the fourteenth century CE, for instance, depicts the Mongols as a branch of Turks in his *Riḥlah*. When he lists the diverse inhabitants of Saray, the capital of the Jochid Ulus, better known as the Golden Horde, he makes a distinction between the Mongols and the Qipchaqs.⁸⁷ However, when Ibn Battuta refers to the nomadic people of the Jochid Ulus in their entirety, he uses the term *Turk*.⁸⁸ Likewise, Ibn Khaldūn (1332–1406), the famous Tunisian historian, also defines the Mongols as being a branch of Turks (*min shu'ūb al-Turk*) in his autobiography.⁸⁹ In another work, Ibn Khaldūn also names a chapter devoted to the Mongols “Report on the Rule of the Tatars [who are one] of the Turkic Tribes” (*al-khabar 'an dawlat al-Tatar min shu'ūb al-Turk*).⁹⁰

Ibn 'Arabshāh (1392–1450), a contemporary of Temūr, also regards the Mongols as a branch of Turks, calling the clan of Chinggis Khan “the Quraish of the Turks”.⁹¹ To designate the Mongols, Ibn 'Arabshāh generally uses the term *Tatar* in his work. However, he uses *Turk* and *Tatar* (*Tatār*) interchangeably, for instance, when referring to the armies of Temūr, thus identifying the Mongols with the Turks.⁹² Jūzjānī (b. 1193), the author of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī*, also classifies the Mongols, as well as the Khitans, as a sort of Turks in his work. For instance, he relates, “the first irruption of the Turks was the tribes of Kara Khita [Qara Khitai] issued from the territory

87 Ibn Baṭūṭah, *Riḥlat Ibn Baṭūṭah, al-musammāh Tuḥfat al-nuẓẓār fī gharā'ib al-amṣār wa-'ajā'ib al-asfār*, 2 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1975), 1: 394; Ibn Battuta, *Ibn Battuta: Travels in Asia and Africa 1325–1354*, trans. H. A. R. Gibb (New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1969), 166.

88 For instance, see Ibn Baṭūṭah, *Riḥlat Ibn Baṭūṭah*, 1: 392; Gibb, *Ibn Battuta*, 164.

89 'Abd al-Rahmān Ibn Khaldūn, *Al-Ta'rīf bi-Ibn Khaldūn wa-riḥlatihi Gharban wa-Sharqan*, ed. Muḥammad ibn Tāwīt al-Ṭanjī (Cairo: Lajnat al-ta'līf wa-al-tarjamah wa-al-nashr, 1951), 351.

90 Another passage in his work runs as follows: “The Tatar and the fact they are [one] of the Turkic tribes have previously been mentioned” (*qad taqaddam lanā dhikr al-Tatar wa annahum min shu'ūb al-Turk*). Ibn Khaldūn, *Tārīkh al-'allāmah Ibn Khaldūn*, ed. Y. A. Dagher, 7 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1956–61), 5: 515.

91 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn 'Arabshāh, *'Ajā'ib al-maḥdūr fī nawā'ib Tīmūr*, ed. Aḥmad Fā'iz al-Ḥimṣī (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1986), 56; J. H. Sanders, trans., *Tamerlane, or Timur the Great Amir: From the Arabic Life by Ahmed Ibn Arabshah* (London: Luzac, 1936), 13.

92 Ibn 'Arabshāh, *'Ajā'ib al-maḥdūr*, 123, 306; Sanders, *Tamerlane*, 64, 169. Ibn 'Arabshāh also refers to the Jochid Ulus as the country of the Tatars, while designating its tribes as Turks. Ibn 'Arabshāh, *'Ajā'ib al-maḥdūr*, 137; Sanders, *Tamerlane*, 76.

of Chin”.⁹³ He also writes: “the Mughals [Mongols] rose up in the kingdom of Chin ... and in all books it is written that the first signs of the end of the time are the outbreak of the Turk ... Among the tribes of Mughals was another Turk ...”.⁹⁴ The Ottoman historian Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī (1541–1600) also attributes the same origin to the Mongols and Turks. In his *Künhü’l-ahbār*, he states that the Ottoman dynasty “is not separate from the tribes of the Turks and Tatars [Mongols]” (*ḳabā’il-i Etrāk u Tātārdan hārij degül*).⁹⁵ Describing the sons of Japheth, son of Noah, he also states that the Turks and Mongols are both descended from Japheth.⁹⁶ Although Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī seldom uses *Turk* as a generic term, he designates Chinggis Khan and the Chinggisid Uzbek khans as the khaqans of the Turks (*havākān-i Türk*).⁹⁷

Like Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī, Evliya Çelebi (1611–ca. 1687), the famous Ottoman traveller, also regards the Mongols and the Ottoman Turks as being one and the same people. For instance, talking about a group of Tatars, he adds that “even the Ottoman Dynasty and all Turkmen tribes are from the Tatar tribe” (*Hattā Āl-i Osmān ve cumle ḳavm-i Türkmān dahi ḳavm-i Tatar’dır*).⁹⁸ Evliya Çelebi also writes: “Indeed, according to historians, the Ottoman Dynasty descends from the Chinggisid Dynasty. They are the cousins of the Chinggisids” (*Hakkā ki Āl-i Osmān be-ḳavl-i müverrihīn Āl-i Cingiziyān neslindendir kim Cingiz Hān’ın ammizādelerindendir*).⁹⁹ In sum, although Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī and Evliya Çelebi use *Turk* mainly as a designation for the Ottoman Turks, they imply that the Mongols and the Ottoman Turks belonged to one single people.

Similarly, the Mongols are on occasion referred to as *Turks* in the official histories composed in the Chinggisid and Timurid states in Central Asia and Iran. The most notable example can be found in the *Jāmi’ al-tavārīkh*, the renowned universal history written for the Ilkhanid ruler Ghazan Khan (r. 1295–1304) by Rashīd al-Dīn Faḫrallāh Hamadānī (1247–1318). In this work, Rashīd al-Dīn designates the original Mongol tribes that had gathered around Chinggis Khan as “the Mongol Turks” (*Atrāk-i Mughūl*)¹⁰⁰ and denotes all Mongol clans as *Turks*.¹⁰¹ Rashīd al-Dīn also uses the terms *Mughūl* and *Turk* at the same time to describe a Mongol army.¹⁰²

93 Minhāj Sirāj Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāsirī: A General History of the Muhammadan Dynasties of Asia, including Hindustan*, trans. H. G. Raverty, 2 vols. (London: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1872–81; repr., New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint, 1970), 2: 900; Minhāj Sirāj Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāsirī*, ed. ‘Abd al-Ḥayy Ḥabībī, 2 vols. (Kabul: Kābul Puhani maṭba‘ah, 1963), 2: 94.

94 Raverty, *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāsirī*, 2: 935–36; Jūzjānī, *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāsirī*, 2: 98.

95 Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī, *Künhü’l-ahbār*, 5 vols. (Istanbul: Takvimhane-i Amire, 1860–68), 1: 16.

96 Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī, *Künhü’l-ahbār*, 2: 93. However, Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī also mentions that the Ottoman dynasty descends from ‘Īs, who does not belong to the line of Japheth. Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī, *Künhü’l-ahbār*, 5: 8.

97 Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī, *Künhü’l-ahbār*, 4: 18.

98 Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, vol. 7, ed. Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman, and Robert Dankoff (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000), 194.

99 Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, 239.

100 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi’ al-tavārīkh*, 1: 112; Thackston, *Jami’u’t-tawarikh*, 1: 79.

In his *Tārīkh-i arba' ulūs*, a history of the Chinggisid dynasty, the Timurid ruler Ulugh Beg (1394–1449), or more precisely, the anonymous author of the *Shajarat al-atrāk*, an abridgement of the *Tārīkh-i arba' ulūs*, refers to the Mongol troops campaigning in Khorezm as *Turks*. Ulugh Beg depicts the Mongols as “the sword swinger Turks of the sky” (*Turk-i tūgh-zan-i falak*), a metaphor for the morning sun.¹⁰³ Ulugh Beg also praises the martial spirit and valour of the Mongols, calling them *Turks*.¹⁰⁴ A later Timurid historian, Khvāndamīr (d. c. 1535), also describes the Mongols as a branch of *Turks* in his *Ḥabīb al-siyar*. For instance, Khvāndamīr calls the Chinggisids and the Timurids “the sultans of the *Turks*” (*salāṭīn-i Turk*).¹⁰⁵ Like Rashīd al-Dīn, Khvāndamīr uses both the terms *Mughūl* and *Turk* to designate a Mongol army operating in Transoxiana.¹⁰⁶

A number of Uzbek historians also referred to the Chinggisids and the Mongols as *Turks* in their works. The anonymous composer who wrote the abridgement of Ulugh Beg’s *Tārīkh-i arba' ulūs* named his work *Shajarat al-atrāk*, meaning “the genealogy of the *Turks*”. Abū al-Ghāzī Bahadur Khan, who wrote a history of the Chinggisids and the Mongols from ancient times to the mid-seventeenth century, also named his work *Šejere-i Türk*, meaning “the genealogy of the *Turks*”. These titles indicate that the two authors of the Chinggisid histories clearly viewed the Chinggisids and the Mongols as *Turks*.¹⁰⁷

Perhaps the identification of the Mongols and the *Turks* is best reflected in Maḥmūd b. Amīr Valī Balkhī’s explanation of the name of the inhabitants of Turkistān. In his *Baḥr al-asrār fī manāqib al-akhyār*, a sixteenth-century encyclopedic work that includes a history of the Chinggisids, Maḥmūd b. Amīr Valī Balkhī argues that the people of Turkistān¹⁰⁸ were formally called *Turks* from the time of Turk, Japheth’s son, to the reign of Mughūl Khan. After Mughūl Khan, their name changed

101 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tavārīkh*, 1: 112–61; Thackston, *Jami'u't-tawarikh*, 1: 79–112.

102 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi' al-tavārīkh*, 2: 726–27; Thackston, *Jami'u't-tawarikh*, 2: 507–8.

103 See *Shajarat al-Atrak*, MS, London, British Library, India Office, Ethé 172, fol. 204. For an abridged English translation, see *Shajarat Ul Atrak: Or Genealogical Tree of the Turks and Tatars*, trans. William Miles (London: Wm. H. Allen, and Co., 1838; repr., Kessinger Publishing, 2007), 146.

104 *Shajarat al-Atrak*, fols. 138–40; Miles, *Shajarat Ul Atrak*, 93–95.

105 Ghiyās al-Dīn b. Humām al-Dīn al-Ḥusainī Khvāndamīr, *Tārīkh-i Ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār-i afrād-i bashar*, ed. Jalāl al-Dīn Humāī, 4 vols. (Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-i Khayyām, 1333/1954–55; 3rd repr. ed., 1362/1984), 3: 4; Thackston, *Habibu's-siyar: Tome Three*, trans. W. M. Thackston, 2 pts. *Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures* 24 ([Cambridge, Mass.]: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1994), 1: 1.

106 Khvāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, 3:28; Thackston, *Habibu's-siyar*, 1: 15.

107 In his *Šejere-i Türk*, Abū al-Ghāzī Bahadur Khan designates the Chinggisids and the Mongols as *Turks* on numerous occasions. See Aboul-Ghāzī Bēhādour Khān, *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatares*, 178–79, 182–83 (text), 187–88, 192–93 (trans.).

108 In modern literature, Turkistan denotes Transoxiana (Western Turkistan) and the Tarim Basin (Eastern Turkistan). However, during the medieval and early modern periods, it denoted the steppes north of the Syr Darya River that was inhabited by Turkic nomads.

to *Mongol* (*Mughūl*). It later became *Uzbek* after the reign of Uzbek Khan. He writes:

From the time of Japheth's son, Turk, to the time of the reign of Mughūl Khan, the people of this land were called *Turks*. After the rule of Mughūl Khān over the tribes of that region, everyone in that country was called *Mughūls*. After ... the reign of Uzbek Khan, the inhabitants of that land are called *Uzbeks* until today (*Turk b. Yāfiṣ tā hangām-i zuhūr-i Mughūl Khān mardum-i īn sarzamīn-rā Turk guftand va ba'd az tasalluṭ-i Mughūl Khān bar aqvām-i ān ḥudūd har ki dar ān mamlakat būd ū-rā Mughūl khvāndand va pas az ... salṭanat-i Uzbek Khān sukkān-i īn sarzamīn-rā tā imrūz Uzbek mīgūyand*).¹⁰⁹

Accordingly, Maḥmūd b. Amīr Valī defines Turkistān as a vast region stretching from the Syr Darya River to the Qara Müren (the Mongol name for the Yellow River),¹¹⁰ that is, the Inner Asian steppe that included the land of the Mongols as well.

This article argues that the identification of the Mongols with the Turks by various writers of the Islamic world should not be understood as reflecting the Turkicisation of the Mongols that took place in Central Asia and the Qipchaq Steppe from the fourteenth century onwards. In essence, *Turk* was an antonym of *Tajik*, meaning the sedentary Iranian population, not an antonym of *Mongol*, in Islamic Central Asia and Iran.¹¹¹ In other words, *Turk* was a term relational to *Tajik*, not to *Mongol*. Let me expand on this point.

In the Qipchaq Steppe, where the sedentary Iranian population was absent, the term *Turk* itself was not used as a self-designation. This can be attested to by the fact that the term *Turk* does not appear in the oral and written histories produced by the Qipchaq Turkic nomads. For instance, the Chaghatay Turkic *Jāmi' al-tavārīkh*, written by Qādir 'Alī Bek Jalāyirī in 1602 in the Kasimov Khanate, does not use the term *Turk* to denote the nomads of the Qipchaq Steppe. When referring to the nomads of present-day Kazakhstan, it uses the term *Uzbek*.¹¹² The same holds true for the anonymous *Dāftār-i Čingiz-nāmā*, which is a history of the Volga Tatars compiled in the late-seventeenth century. This history based on the oral traditions of the Qipchaq steppe contains descriptions of the fictitious life of Chinggis Khan and

109 Makhmud ibn Vali, *More tayn otositel'no do'lestey blagorodnykh (geografiya)*, trans. B. A. Akhmedov (Tashkent: Izdatel'stvo "Fan", 1977), fols. 156a–156b.

110 Makhmud ibn Vali, *More tayn*, 32.

111 For the term *Tajik* in relation to the name *Turk*, see Maria Eva Subtelny, "The Symbiosis of Turk and Tajik", in *Central Asia in Historical Perspective*, ed. Beatrice F. Manz (Boulder, Co: Westview, 1994), 48–49.

112 For instance, it states that certain Qazaq tribal leaders are "famous and well known among the Uzbekya" (*Özbäkya arasında ma'lūm mashhūr turur*). See Qādir 'Alī Bek Jalāyirī, *Sbornik letopisei*, 171. Qādir 'Alī Bek Jalāyirī's *Jāmi' al-tavārīkh* is made up of an abridged Chaghatay Turkic translation of Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmi' al-tavārīkh* and several *dāstāns*, or tales, devoted to Jochid khans. In the former, the term *Turk* is used.

Temür but does not use *Turk* to denote the nomadic entity to which the two belonged.¹¹³ Likewise, the *‘Umdat al-aḥbār*, a Crimean Tatar chronicle written by ‘Abd al-Ghaffār Qırımī in Ottoman Turkish in 1744, uses the terms *Tatar* and *Moğul* for the Chinggisids and the Crimean Tatars. For instance, it describes a non-Muslim funeral ritual performed by the Tatars as being in accordance with “the Mongol and Tatar custom” (*‘ādet-i Moğul ve Tātār*).¹¹⁴ When it offers an etymological interpretation of the ethnonym *Qalmaq*, it calls the nomadic people of the Qipchaq Steppe “the Mongols and Tatars” (*qavm-i Moğul ve Tātār*).¹¹⁵ Furthermore, the oral traditions of the Turkic nomads of the Qipchaq Steppe do not use *Turk* as a designation either. For instance, the Noghay or Crimean Tatar oral epic “Chora Batır (Hero Chora)”, the Qazaq oral epic “Qambar Batır (Hero Qambar)”, and the Noghay oral tradition “Epic of Edigü” do not make mention of the designation *Turk*. Another piece of evidence that shows that the term *Turk* was not used as a self-designation by the Turkic nomads of the Qipchaq Steppe is provided by Sigismund von Herberstein, the envoy sent to Muscovy by Emperor Maximilian I in 1517. Sigismund von Herberstein records that the Tatars of the Qipchaq Steppe “are highly offended if they are called Turks, and consider it a reproach ...”¹¹⁶

This article argues that the use of *Turk* as a self-designation by the Mongols or their Turkicised descendants in Central Asia was compatible with the preservation of their Mongol identity. Although the Mongol *ulus*es, or peoples, acquired several different designations after the dissolution of the Mongol Empire, *Moghul* still continued to be used in Central Asian sources as a term denoting the identity of the Turkicised Mongol elites and their ancestors. For instance, the nomads of the eastern branch of the Chaghatayid Khanate named their nation the *Moghul ulus*.¹¹⁷ Similarly, the designation *Moghul* was also used in the Timurid state, the western Chaghatayid *ulus*,¹¹⁸ by historians in relation to Temür’s career and lineage. For in-

113 *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende (Däftär-i Čingiz-nāmā)*, ed. A. Mirkasym Usmanov and Mária Ivanics, *Studia Uralo-Altaica* 44 (Szeged: University of Szeged, 2002), 47–49, 64.

114 ‘Abdülghaffār Qırımī, *‘Umdet-üt-tevārīh*, ed. Najīb ‘Āsim, supplement to *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası* (Istanbul: AH 1343), 34.

115 Qırımī, *‘Umdet-üt-tevārīh*, 37.

116 Sigmund Herberstein, *Notes upon Russia: Being a Translation of the Earliest Account of that Country, Entitled Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii* (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1851–52; repr., New York: Burt Franklin, 1963), 2: 53.

117 *Moghul* as used by the eastern Chaghatays had a narrower meaning when compared to that used in the Mongol era. According to Muḥammad Ḥaidar Dughlāt, it only denoted the people of the Chaghatayid Khanate. Mentioning Ulugh Beg’s work on the four Chinggisid *ulus*es, he relates that “one of the four is the *Mughūl*. The *Mughūl* has become divided into two branches. One is the *Mughūl* and the other is the *Chaghatāy* (*az ulūs-i arba’ yikī Mughūl ast. Va Mughūl bi-dau qism maqsūm shoda-ast. Yikī Mughūl va dīgarī Chaghatāy*)”. See Muḥammad Ḥaidar Dughlāt Mīrzā, *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī*, ed. ‘Abbāsquī Ghaffārī Fard (Tehran: Mīrās-i Makṭūb, 2004), 190.

118 The term *ulūs-i Chaghatāy* was used as the designation for the nomads of the Chaghatayid Khanate and later the Timurids. The Timurid Mughals were also referred to as *Chaghatāy*s by contemporaries.

stance, the *Mu'izz al-ansāb fī shajarat al-ansāb*, a genealogy of the Timurids and Chinggisids, describes Temür as being of Mongol descent. Mentioning the ancestors and the tribe of Temür, he adds that “the chroniclers of the Turks, who are true in intellect, write that all the Mongol tribes descend from two persons who had gone to Ergüne Qun” (*mu'arrikhān-i atrāk-i sādīq al-'uqūl chunān taqrīr mīkunand ki tamāmat-i aqvām-i mughūl az nasl-i dau shakhshand ki dar Arkana Qutūqūn rafta būdand*).¹¹⁹ Mu'īn al-Dīn Naṭanzī and Khvāndamīr also associate Temür with the Mongols. Describing Temür's military campaign against Urus Khan, Naṭanzī writes that Temür “threw ... according to the Mongol custom and he returned” (*bar qā'ida-i sunnat-i Mughūl sarā ān bi-andākht va bāz gardīd*).¹²⁰ Praising Temür's noble lineage, Khvāndamīr remarks that “the Mongol commanders have always preserved the genealogy of forefathers ...” (*umarā'-i mughūl payvasta silsila-i nasab-i ābā u ajdād rā mahfūz dāshā*).¹²¹ According to Ibn 'Arabshāh, Temür himself possessed a Mongol identity. When he called upon the Tatars (i.e., the Mongols) residing in Anatolia since the Ilkhanid period to join him in his battle against the Ottoman sultan, Bayezid I (r. 1389–1402), he wrote to them: “we have the same ancestors, we are all shoots and branches of the same tree” (*wa ajdādunā ajdādukum, fa kullunā furū'u nab'ahu wa aghṣānu dauḥahu*).¹²² Abū al-Fāzl (d. 1602), the court historian

119 *Mu'izz al-ansāb fī shajarat al-ansāb*, trans. and ed. M. Kh. Abuseitova and others, Istoriya Kazakhstana v persidskikh istochnikakh 3 (Almaty: Dayk, 2006), fol. 3a.

120 I was unable to translate the whole passage. Mu'īn al-Dīn Naṭanzī, *Muntakhab al-tavārīkh-i Mu'īnī*, ed. Jean Aubin (Tehran: Khayyam, 1336/1957), 425.

121 Khvāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, 3:392.

122 Ibn 'Arabshāh, *'Ajā'ib*, 320; Sanders, *Tamerlane*, 178. As mentioned in footnote 38, Babur, a descendant of Temür and the founder of the Mughal Empire, uses *Turk* mostly in a narrow sense to refer to the Turkic subjects of the Timurid polities in his *Bābur-nāma*. He does not designate the Moghuls, the eastern Chaghatays, as *Turks*. However, this does not mean that Babur had a Turkic identity that was opposed to Mongol identity. It should be noted that Babur does not use the terms *Turk* and *Mogul* in the modern sense. He does not call the Uzbeks and Qazaqs, who were Turkic-speaking peoples, *Turks*. In other words, Babur does not identify the Turkic nomadic peoples of the Qipchaq Steppe with his Timurid *Turks*. While Babur sometimes uses *Mogul* to denote the Mongolian language, he does not use it to refer to Chinggis Khan and the Mongols of the thirteenth century. When Babur talks about how sedulously his “fathers and forefathers” abided by the Chinggisid Law (*Yasa*), he does not differentiate between Chinggis Khan and his Timurid ancestors. See Zahiruddin Muhammad Babur Mirza, *Baburnama*, ed. and trans. W. M. Thackston, Jr., 3 pts. (Cambridge, MA: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1993), 2: 391. As mentioned in footnote 117, *Mogul* was the name of the people of the Chaghatayid Khanate. One should note that Central Asian writers of the post-Mongol period used the term *Mogul* (*Mughūl* in Persian) in two senses: one for “the Mongols proper” and the other for the people of Moghulistan, that is, the eastern branch of the Chaghatayid Khanate. Furthermore, Babur includes his Moghul retainers in the category of the “Turk officers” (*Türk umarā*) after his conquest of northern India, using *Turk* also as a broad term that encompasses the Moghuls. See Thackston, *Baburnama*, 3: 699. This implies that Babur may also have viewed the Mongols as *Turks* in the broad sense. In sum, Babur's Turkic identity should be viewed

of the Timurid Mughal empire, also identifies the Timurids as Mongol in his work. He relates that the (Central Asian and Indian) Timurids belong to the Mongol people (*shaʿb-i Mughul*) and refers to their ancestors as the Mongol *ulus* (*ulus-i Mughul*) or the Mongol tribe (*qaum-i Mughul*).¹²³

Temür was also regarded as *Mongol* by various non-Timurid writers. For instance, describing the meeting between himself and Temür, Ibn Khaldūn calls the latter “the *sultān* of the *Mughul* and *Tatar*”.¹²⁴ Ibn Kemāl (Kemalpaşazāde), the author of the *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ʿOşman*, refers to Temür’s army as *Tatars*.¹²⁵ Muştafā ʿĀlī describes Temür as Mongol when he explains that Temür belongs to “the Tatar tribe called the *Barlas ulus*” (*ulus-i Barlas nām Tatar kabīlesi*).¹²⁶ Muştafā ʿĀlī also writes that Temür held a banquet according to “the Mongol custom” (*Moğul āyīni*) after his conquest of Anatolia.¹²⁷ Evliya Çelebi, in his *Seyāhatnāme*, also calls Temür *Tatar*, a term he consistently applies to the Mongols and the Crimean Tatars. Describing the Crimean Tatar city Eski Kırım, Evliya Çelebi writes “because of Eski Kırım, the Tatars of Hülegü, the Tatars of Chinggis Khan, the Tatars of Temür, and the Tatars of Toqtamış Khan came to Crimea and left after assaulting and plundering” (*bu Eski Kırım sebebiyle Hulāgū Tatarı ve Cingiz Hān Tatarı ve Timur Leng Tatarı ve Tohtamış Hān Tatarları Kırım’a gelüp nehb [ü] gāretler edüp gütmişlerdir*).¹²⁸

The nomad elements of the Crimean Khanate, who were identified with the Mongols by Evliya Çelebi, maintained or preserved a Mongol identity in the early sixteenth century. In a letter sent to the Polish king, the Crimean khan Mehmed Girāy (r. 1514–23) styled himself as the khan of all the Mongols. He writes “the great khan of the Great Horde, the Qipchaq steppe, and all the Mongols, pādshāh Mehmed Girāy Khan” (*ulu ordanung ulu hanı Deşt-i Kīpçāk barça Moğul pādshāhi Mehmed Girāy Han*).¹²⁹ In addition, the Crimean Tatar chronicles describe the early

as an expression of pride in Timurid lineage as opposed to (eastern) Chaghatayid lineage, but not as a non-Mongol identity.

123 Abu’l-Fazl, *The History of Akbar*, vol. I, ed. and trans. Wheeler M. Thackston (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2015), 198, 200, 212 (text), 199, 201, 213 (trans.).

124 Ibn Khaldūn, *Al-Taʿrīf*, 366.

125 Ibn-i Kemal, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i Osman*, vol. 3, ed. Şerafettin Turan (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1970), 369. The Ottoman chroniclers also used Chaghatāy, a term that reflects Mongol identity, to designate the Timurids. For instance, the Timurid ruler of Samarqand Sultān-Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā (r. 1451–69) is referred to as “the Chaghatay pādshāh” in an Ottoman chronicle. See Öztürk, Necdet, *Anonim Osmanlı kroniği, 1299–1512, İstanbul* (İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 2000), 128.

126 Gelibolulu Mustafa Ālī, *Füsül-i hall ü akd ve usûl-i harc ü nakd: İslam devletleri tarihi; 622–1599*, ed. Mustafa Demir (İstanbul: Değişim Yayınları, 2006), 105.

127 Muştafā ʿĀlī, *Künhü’l-ahbār*, 5: 99.

128 Evliya Çelebi, *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, 7: 251.

129 V. Veliaminof-Zernof, *Matériaux pour servir à l’histoire du Khanat de Crimée: Extrait*, par ordre de l’Académie impériale des sciences, des archives centrales du Ministère des affaires étrangères, à Moscou (Saint-Petersbourg, 1864), 2.

Mongols and the Crimean Tatars as one and the same people. They use the term *Tatar* for both entities. For instance, the *Umdat al-aḥbār*, as mentioned above, refers to the nomadic people of the Qipchaq Steppe that included the Crimean Tatars as “the Mongols and Tatars” (*ḳavm-i Moḡul ve Tātār*) when it explains the etymology of the term *Qalmaq*.¹³⁰

The designation *Moghul* was also used by and for another Chinggisid state, the Uzbek Khanate in Transoxiana. For instance, Muḥammad Shībānī Khan (r. 1501–10) calls the people, to which he belongs, *Moghul* in a ghazal he wrote in Chaghatay Turkic. He writes “all the people are contained in me, but I am not contained in this people. The good and the evil are contained in me, but I am not contained among the Mongols” (*Barʿa ulus mendā siḡar, men bu ulusa siḡmasam. Yaḡṣī yaman mendā siḡar, men bu Moḡula siḡmasam*).¹³¹ Mūnis and Āḡahī, the authors of the *Firdaws al-Iqbāl*, a history of the Qunghrat Uzbek dynasty, or the Khiva Khanate, written in the early nineteenth century, describe the Turkicised Qunghrat tribe, to which their overlord belonged, as being one of “the Mongol tribes” (*aqvām-i Moḡul*).¹³² Maḥmūd b. Amīr Valī also designates his master Naḡr Muḥammad Khan (r. 1606–42 and 1648–51) and the Toḡay-Timurid Uzbek dynasty, to which the latter belonged, as Mongol. In his *Baḡr al-asrār fī manāqib al-akhyār*, he names the section dealing with the Uzbek khans as follows:

On the description of the conditions of the Mongol khans from the appearance of the dawn of the blessed existence of Japheth, the son of Noah, peace be upon them both, to the happy days of his Excellency who has the rank of caliph, Naḡr Muḥammad Khan ... (*dar tauzīḥ-i aḥvāl-i khavāqīn-i Muḡhūl az badv-i zuḡūr-i ṣubḥ-i vujūd-i masʿūd-i Yāfīs ibn Nuḡ al-ayḡimā al-salām tā ayyām-i bā farjām-i ḡazrat-i khilāfat-rutbat Naḡr Muḥammad Khān ...*).¹³³

Consequently, it is natural that the Qazaqs, who were regarded as one and the same people with the Uzbeks by contemporaries,¹³⁴ were associated with the Mongols by

130 Kırımī, *Umdat-üt-tevārīḡ*, 37.

131 Yakup Karasoy, ed., *Şiban Han Dīvānı* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1998), 184, 795; also see Andrés J. E. Bodrogligeti, “Muḥammad Shaybānī Khān’s Apology to the Muslim Clergy”, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 13 (1993–94): 99.

132 Shīr Muḥammad Mīrāb Mūnīs and Muḥammad Rīzā Mīrāb Āḡahī, *Firdaws al-Iqbāl: History of Khorezm*, ed. Yuri Bregel (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 193; Shīr Muḥammad Mīrāb Mūnīs and Muḥammad Rīzā Mīrāb Āḡahī, *Firdaws al-iqbāl: History of Khorezm*, trans. Yuri Bregel, *Islamic History and Civilization* 28 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 82.

133 Maḥmūd b. Amīr Valī, *Baḡr al-asrār fī maʿrifat il-akhyār*, vol. 1, part 1, ed. Ḥakīm Muḥammad Saʿīd, Sayyid Muḥīn al-Ḥaqq, and Anṣār Zāhid Khān (Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, 1984), 17 (text).

134 For instance, Fazlallāh b. Rūzbihān Khunjī relates that there were three tribes (ṭāyifa) that “belong to the Uzbeks” (*mansūb bi-Uzbek*). The first was the Shibanids (Shibānīyān). The second was the Qazaqs (Qazāq), “who are, in strength and ferocity, well known throughout the world” (*ki dar quvva va baʿs mashḡūr-i āfāqand*). The third was the Manghit (Manfīt [sic]), “who are the rulers of Hājjī Tarkhān” (*ki īshān pādshāhān-i Hājjī Tarkhān-and*).

Fazlallāh b. Rūzbihān Khunjī, the court historian of Muḥammad Shībānī Khan. In the *Mihmān-nāma-i Bukhārā*, Khunjī identifies the Qazaqs with the Tatars, i.e., the Mongols. His description of the Qazaqs runs as follows:

The terrible ferocity and violence of the army of the Qazaqs, who, previously, at the time of the appearance of Chinggis Khan, were called the army of the Tatars, are well known and mentioned by the Arabs and the Persians (*ṣaulat va ba's-i shadīd-i 'askar-i Qazzāq ki dar zamānhā-i sābiq ki bi'ādī-zuhūr-i Chingīz Khān būd, īshān-rā lashkar-i Tātār guftandī mashhūr va mazkūr-i alsina-i 'arab va 'ajam ast*).¹³⁵

The Qazaqs probably shared the same idea about their ancestry with Khunjī. According to an account recorded by N. I. Grodekov in the late nineteenth century, a Qazaq named Sulḥān Qanaev expressed the view that the Qazaqs descend from three hundred Mongols in the following manner:

There were two brothers, Mongol and Tatar. From the former descend the Qazaqs. The Mongols fought against the Tatars and were defeated by them. Three hundred men escaped from the battle and began to call themselves the Three Hundred. They took refuge in a mountain. They multiplied there and went out to the steppe.¹³⁶

In an oral tradition collected by Vasily Vasilievich Radlov in the nineteenth century, the Qazaqs are depicted as a people who are descended from the people to whom Chinggis Khan belonged.¹³⁷ Although the designation “Mongol” does not appear in this oral tradition, one may conclude that the Qazaqs of the nineteenth century and earlier did not see the Mongols of the thirteenth century as foreigners.

The identification of the Mongols with the “Turks” was also made in various Chinggisid and Timurid genealogies composed by Ilkhanid, Timurid, and Uzbek court historians. Significantly, these dynastic genealogies claimed that the Chinggisid or Timurid dynasty belonged to the noblest branch of Japheth's descendants and the Inner Asian nomads. In the *Jāmi' al-tavārikh*, Rashīd al-Dīn presents a Chinggisid genealogy, which is based on both Mongol and Islamic historiographical

Fazlallāh b. Rūzbihān [Isfahānī] Khunjī, *Mihmān-nāma-i Bukhārā: Tārīkh-i pādshāhī-i Muḥammad Shībānī*, ed. Manūchihr Sutūda (Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjuma va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1341/1962), 41. Consequently, Khunjī argues that “the Qazaqs are a branch of the Uzbeks” (*Qazzāq yik īyīfa az Uzbek-and*). Khunjī, *Mihmān-nāma-i Bukhārā*, 171.

135 Khunjī, *Mihmān-nāma-i Bukhārā*, 213.

136 N. I. Grodekov, *Kirgizi i karakirgizy Syr-Dar'inskoi oblasti*, vol. 1 (Tashkent: Tipografya S. I. Lakhtina, 1889), 2.

137 Interestingly, this oral tradition relates that the rulers of the Qazaqs are descended from the three half-brothers of Chinggis Khan. V. V. Radlov, *Proben der Volksliteratur der Nördlichen Türkischen Stämme*, vol. 3, bk. 1, *Kirgisische Mundarten* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoy Akademii Nauk, 1870; repr., Berlin: Zentral-Antiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1965), 68 (text); Radlov, *Proben*, bk. 2, 89 (trans.).

traditions. According to this genealogy, Chinggis Khan descends from the biblical figure Yāfaš (Japheth), also called Abūlja Khān, son of Nūḥ (Noah), through such figures as Qiyan (Qiyān), who, along with Nūkūz (Nukūz), took refuge in a grassy plain (*ṣaḥrā-i pur ‘alaf*) called Ergüne Qun (Arkana-qūn), meaning a valley of wall (*kamar-i sadd*); an *amīr* named Bōrtā China (Būrta Chīna); Alan Qo’a (Ālān Quvā), a female ancestor of Chinggis Khan, who was impregnated by a “radiant being” and gave birth to three sons, including Bodonchar (Būzanchar); Tūmina Khān, who was the father of Qabul Khān and Qāchūlī.¹³⁸ In this genealogy, Rashīd al-Dīn traces the origins of the Mongols, whom he calls “the Mongol Turks” (*Turk-i Mughūl*),¹³⁹ and other nomadic Turks (*Atrāk-i ṣaḥrā-nishīn*) to the four sons of Dīb Bāqūy, son of Yāfaš.¹⁴⁰ However, Rashīd al-Dīn differentiates the Mongols from “the tribes of Oghuz” (*aqvām-i Ūghūz*), who descend from the twenty four branches of Oghuz, a descendant of Yāfaš, who was famed for his conversion to Islam or monotheism.¹⁴¹

The Japhetic genealogy of the Chinggisids developed by Rashīd al-Dīn was adopted and expanded by the Timurid historian Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī Yazdī (d. 1454). In the Introduction (*muqaddima*) to the *Ẓafarnāma*, composed for Ibrāhīm Sulṭān (r. 1415–35), the grandson of Timur ruling over Shiraz and the western parts of Iran, Yazdī presents Turk as the son of Yāfaš, also called Abū al-Turk.¹⁴² Yazdī describes Turk Khan as the eponymous ancestor of the Turks and inventor of the tent, that is, the nomadic way of life.¹⁴³ Yazdī introduces another figure named Mughūl, who had a twin brother named Tātār, as a descendant of Turk and common ancestor of Chinggis Khan and Temūr.¹⁴⁴ According to this genealogy, the Mongols, i.e. the descendants of Mughūl Khan, are a branch of Turks. Unlike Rashīd al-Dīn, Yazdī includes Oghuz (Ughūz) among the ancestors of Chinggis Khan and describes him as a descendant of Mughūl.¹⁴⁵ Furthermore, Yazdī relates that the descendants of Mughūl Khan, whom he refers to as Mongols, nearly became annihilated when they were heavily defeated by the descendants of Tātār Khan, whom he calls Tatars, and that only Qiyan (Qiyān) and Nūkūz (Nukūz), along with some female survivors, escaped to the Ergüne Qun (Arkana-qūn) valley.¹⁴⁶ Yazdī also mentions figures such as Alan Qo’a (Ālān Qū), Bodonchar Qa’an (Būzanchar Qā’ān), and Tūmina Khan, all of whom are also mentioned in the *Jāmi’ al-tavārīkh*, as the common ancestors of the

138 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi’ al-tavārīkh*, 1: 113, 167–86; Thackston, *Jami’u’t-tawarikh*, 1: 80, 114–25.

139 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi’ al-tavārīkh*, 1: 112; Thackston, *Jami’u’t-tawarikh*, 1: 79.

140 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi’ al-tavārīkh*, 1: 25–26; Thackston, *Jami’u’t-tawarikh*, 1: 25.

141 Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmi’ al-tavārīkh*, 1: 29; Thackston, *Jami’u’t-tawarikh*, 1: 27.

142 Yazdī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, fol. 16a.

143 Turk, although not mentioned by Rashīd al-Dīn, had been presented as the ancestor of the Turks by Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī as mentioned above.

144 Yazdī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, fol. 17b.

145 Yazdī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, fol. 18a.

146 Yazdī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, fols. 21a–b.

Chinggisids and the Timurids.¹⁴⁷ In Yazdī's version of the Inner Asian genealogy, the two lineages split in the generation of Tūmina Khan's two sons, Qabul Khan and Qāchūlī. The Chinggisids descend from the former, while the Timurids spring from the latter.¹⁴⁸

Yazdī's version of the Chinggisid and Timurid genealogy that describes Chinggis Khan, Temür, and the Mongols as descending from Japheth through Turk Khan and Mughūl Khan was widely adopted by other Timurid historians. Ulugh Beg includes Yāfaṣ, Turk, also called Yāfaṣ Oghlan (Yāfaṣ Ughlān), Mughūl, Mughūl's twin brother Tātār, and Oghuz in his genealogical account of the Chinggisids and the Timurids.¹⁴⁹ *Mīr Khvānd and his grandson Khvāndamīr* also provide an identical genealogy in the *Tārīkh-i Rauzat al-ṣafā*¹⁵⁰ and the *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, respectively.¹⁵¹ Abū al-Fazl (d. 1602), the court historian of the Timurid Mughal empire, also reiterates Yazdī's account.¹⁵²

The Shibanid and Toqay-Timurid Uzbek court historians also created dynastic genealogies based on those developed by the Ilkhanid and Timurid historians. For instance, the anonymous *Shībānī-nāma*, a Chaghatay Turkic source written in the mid-sixteenth century, presents a dynastic genealogy that lists figures such as Yāfaṣ, also called Abū al-Turk, Turk, Mughūl, Oghuz (Ughūz), Qiyan (Qiyān), Alan Qo'a (Alān Quvā), Tūmina Khān, and Qabul, among others, as the ancestors of the Chinggisids.¹⁵³ Ḥāfīz Tanīsh Bukhārī, in his *ʿAbdallāh-nāma*, or *Sharaf-nāma-i shāhī*, writes that his overlord ʿAbdallāh Khan II (r. 1583–98) descends from Yāfaṣ, whom he also calls Īlcha Khān, his son Dīb Bāqūy (Dīb Bāuqūy), Mughūl, Oghuz (Ughūz), Qiyan (Qiyān), Nūkūz (Nukūz), Alan Qo'a (Alān Quvā), and Bodonchar (Būzanchar Qāʿān).¹⁵⁴ Maḥmūd b. Amīr Valī also provides a Chinggisid genealogy in his *Baḥr al-asrār fī manāqib al-akhyār* that includes Yāfaṣ, Turk, Mughūl, and Oghuz (Ughūz), as well as Alan Qo'a (Alān Quvā) and Bodonchar (Būzanjar Khān).¹⁵⁵ Muḥammad Yūsuf Munshī, the court historian for Muḥammad Muqīm Khān, the Uzbek ruler of Balkh, presents a Chinggisid genealogy that includes Yāfaṣ, also called Īlcha

147 Yazdī, *Zafar-nāma*, fols. 22a–25a.

148 Yazdī, *Zafar-nāma*, fol. 24b. Qāchūlī is presented as the ancestor of the Barlas clan, to which the future Temür belonged, in the *Jāmiʿ al-tavārīkh*. See Rashīd al-Dīn, *Jāmiʿ al-tavārīkh*, 1: 185; Thackston, *Jamiʿuʿt-tawarikh*, 1: 125.

149 *Shajarat al-Atrak*, fols. 15b–46b; Miles, *Shajarat Ul Atrak*, 22–43.

150 Muḥammad ibn Khāvandshāh Mīr Khvānd, *Tārīkh-i Rauzat al-ṣafā*, ed. Rizā Qulī Khān, 6 vols. (Tehran: Pīrūz, 1960), 6: 776.

151 Khvāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, 3: 4–6; Thackston, *Habibu's-siyar*, 1: 1–3.

152 Abu-l-Fazl, *The Akbar Nama of Abu-l-Fazl Translated from the Persian by H. Beveridge*, trans. H. Beveridge, 3 vols. (Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1902–39; repr., Delhi: LPP, 1998), 1: 167–70.

153 Berezin, *Sheybaniada*, 2–26.

154 Ḥāfīz Tanīsh, *Sharaf-nāma*, fols. 10a–24a (text), 1: 47–72 (trans.).

155 Maḥmūd b. Amīr Valī, *Baḥr al-asrār*, fols. 275a–276b.

Khān, Alan Qo'a (Alān Quvā), Bodonchar (Būzanjar Qā'ān), and Tūmina Khān in his *Tazkira-i Muqīm Khānī*.¹⁵⁶

The Uzbek histories composed in the Chinggisid 'Arabshāhid and the non-Chinggisid Qunghrat dynasties located in Khiva and in the Ming dynasty based in Khoqand also follow the same historiographical tradition. In his Chaghatay Turkic *Šejere-i Türk*, Abū al-Ghāzī Bahadur Khan describes Chinggis Khan as a descendant of such figures as Yāfaš, Turk, Mughūl, Qiyān, and Alan Qo'a, and presents the Mongols as the main branch of Turks.¹⁵⁷ So does Shīr Muḥammad Mīrāb Mūnīs.¹⁵⁸ In his *Tārīkh-i Shāhrukhī*, a chronicle of the Khoqand Khanate written in 1871–72 for Khudāyār Khān (r. 1845–75, with interruptions), Niyāz Muḥammad b. Mullā 'Ashūr modifies Sharaf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī's version of the Timurid genealogy in order to link his non-Chinggisid overlords to a son of Zāhīr al-Dīn Muḥammad Babur. However, Niyāz Muḥammad b. Mullā 'Ashūr also describes Chinggis Khan and Temūr as descendants of Yāfaš, Turk, Mughūl, Qiyān (Qiyān), Alan Qo'a (An), and Bodonchar (Būzanjar Khān).¹⁵⁹

Importantly, the above-discussed genealogies legitimise the Chinggisid and Timurid dynasties by according a clearly inferior status to the Oghuz Turks, including the Ottoman dynasty. For instance, whereas Yazdī describes the Chinggisids and the Timurids as the descendants of Turk, the son of Japheth, he describes the Turkmens as the descendants of Mansak, another son of Japheth.¹⁶⁰ Yazdī also relates that the Turks and the Turkmens were enemies since the days of Turk and Ghuzz, son of Mansak.¹⁶¹ Similarly, Ulugh Beg differentiates the Turkmens from the Turks to whom the Mongols belong, explaining that the former descend from Mansak, not from Turk. Ulugh Beg also remarks that the Turkmens are "the worst Turkic tribes" (*badtarīn aqvām-i Turk*).¹⁶² Furthermore, Ulugh Beg adds that the Ottomans descend from Chīn, another son of Japheth. He argues that Oghuz (Ughūz) Khan, from whom the Ottoman dynasty descends, is not to be confused with his namesake from whom the Chinggisids and Timurids descend. The former is a descendant of Chīn, whereas the latter is a progeny of Turk and Mughūl.¹⁶³ Mīr Khvānd also presents a similar view of the Turkmens in his *Rauzat al-ṣafā*. He clearly differentiates the Turks and the Turkmens remarking that "the Turkmens are a separate group of people different from the Turks, and they are called *Turkman* on account of their resemblance to the Turks" (*Turkmān qaumī 'alāḥidda-and varā-i Turkān va ishān rā bi-*

156 Munshī, *Tazkira-i Muqīm Khānī*, 59–65.

157 Aboul-Ghāzī Bēhādour Khān, *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatares*, 9–68 (text), 8–72 (trans.).

158 Mūnīs, *Firdaws al-Iqbāl*, 50–89.

159 Niyāz Muḥammad b. Mullā 'Ashūr, *Taarikh Shakhrokhī: Istoriya vladeteley Fergany*, ed. N. N. Pantusov (Kazan: Tipografiya Imperatorskago Universiteta, 1885), 173–74.

160 Yazdī, *Zafar-nāma*, fol. 16b.

161 Yazdī, *Zafar-nāma*, fol. 16b.

162 *Shajarat al-Atrāk*, fols. 34–35; Miles, *Shajarat Ul Atrak*, 26. Qazvīnī had presented Mansak, son of Yāfaš, as the ancestor of the Mongols. Qazvīnī, *Tārīkh-i guzīda*, 562.

163 *Shajarat al-Atrāk*, fols. 61–2; Miles, *Shajarat Ul Atrak*, 40–41.

vāsiṭa-i mushābahat bā atrāk Turkmān gufta-and).¹⁶⁴ Like Ulugh Beg, Mīr Khvānd also adds that the Turkmens are “the worst sort of Turks” (*badtarīn ṭabaqāt-i Turk*).¹⁶⁵ Khvāndamīr reiterates his grandfather’s words in his *Ḥabīb al-siyar*: “the Turkmens are a separate tribe and have no relationship with the Turks” (*Turkmān qaumī ‘alāḥidda-and va bi-Turkān nisbat-i qarābatī nadārand*).¹⁶⁶ Khvāndamīr also writes that the Turkmens are “the worst Mongol tribes” (*badtarīn aqvām-i Mu-ghūl*).¹⁶⁷

As a matter of fact, the Ottoman chroniclers showed no comparable interest in the Turkic nomadic background of the Ottoman dynasty except for its descent from Oghuz. For instance, although they were aware that Turk was regarded by Central Asian Turkic peoples as the ancestor of the Turks, the Ottoman court historians do not mention Turk Khan or any equivalent figure who may represent the progenitor of Inner Asian nomads in their genealogical accounts.¹⁶⁸ The Ottoman chroniclers further depart from the Chinggisid and Timurid court historians in the way they view the Persians. Unlike the Chinggisid and Timurid court historians, Āşıkpaşazāde includes Persians amongst the descendants of Japheth.¹⁶⁹ Ibn Kemāl (Kemalpaşazāde) in his *Tevārīḥ-i Āl-i ‘Oşman* even breaks away from the Japhetic tradition by presenting Oghuz and Osman as the descendants of Shem, son of Noah, not of Japheth, making the family of Osman kinsmen of the Persian pādshāhs.¹⁷⁰ Their interest in the Oghuz tradition diminished after the conquest of Constantinople, and they even created genealogical accounts linking the family of Osman to the Arabs or the Byzantines.¹⁷¹ The fact that the Ottoman historians invented diverse dynastic ge-

164 Mīr Khvānd, *Tārīkh-i Rauzat al-şafā*, 5: 14;

165 Mīr Khvānd, *Tārīkh-i Rauzat al-şafā*, 5: 5.

166 Khvāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, 3: 9.

167 Khvāndamīr, *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, 3: 5.

168 For instance, Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī had already stated in his *Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk* that “the Turks ... all trace back to Turk, son of Japheth. Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī, *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects*, 1: 82. A nineteenth-century Ottoman document containing a description of the Khoqand Khanate also shows that the Ottomans were aware of Turk, son of Japheth. It contains the following passage: “Turkistān is called so because the people of this region are the descendants of Turk, son of Japheth, son of Noah the Prophet Peace be upon him” (*ol tarafīn ehālisi Türk ibn-i Yâfes ibn-i Nüh-î peyghamber ‘aleyhisselāmīng evladından olduqları hasebi ile Türkistân ta’bîr etmişler*). Baqué-Grammont, Jean-Louis, “Tūrân, une description du Khanat de Khokand vers 1832 d’après un document ottoman”, *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 13, no. 2 (1972): 194 (text), 198 (trans.).

169 Āşık Paşazāde, *Osmanoğulları’nın tarihi*, ed. Kemal Yavuz and M. A. Yekta Saraç (Istanbul: K Kitaplığı, 2003), 321.

170 Ibn-i Kemal, *Tevārīḥ-i Āl-i Osman*, vol. 1, ed. Şerafettin Turan (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1970), 44.

171 In the 1460s, the Ottoman historian Enveri presented a genealogy in which Oghuz Khan appears as the progeny of a companion of the Prophet called ‘Iyad and the daughter of a Turkish chief called Oghuz Tumen Khan. See Colin Imber, “The Ottoman Dynastic Myth”, *Turcica* 19 (1987): 18. In another account, a Byzantine prince of the house of the Comneni, who converted to Islam and married a daughter of a Seljuk sultan in the twelfth-century, ap-

nealogies indicates that their Turkic identity was not as strong as that of the Chinggisids and the Timurids of Central Asia.¹⁷²

Conclusion

In this article, I examined the historical usage of the term *Turk* in order to clarify the nature of the Turkic identity of the Chinggisid and Timurid elites in post-Mongol Central Asia.

The term *Turk* first came into use as a designation denoting the Kök Türks of the First and Second Türk Khaganates. After the fall of the Second Türk Khaganate, the term *Turk* went out of use in the Mongolian steppes since other Turkic peoples such as the Uighurs and Qirghiz, who did not identify themselves with the Kök Türks, did not use *Turk* as a self-appellation. Accordingly, medieval Chinese, Tibetan, and Mongol historians did not use *Turk* as a collective term denoting Inner Asian tribes. On the other hand, medieval Muslim writers, who tended to regard Inner Asian tribes as forming a single entity regardless of their linguistic affiliation, commonly used *Turk* as a generic term.

In pre-modern Inner Asia, nomadic confederations were often made up of tribes of diverse linguistic backgrounds. Turkic-speaking tribes and non-Turkic-speaking tribes, including the Mongols, often developed a common identity. Accordingly, neither the Muslim writers who used the name *Turk* as a generic term nor the Chinese and eastern Inner Asian writers who used *Turk* as a narrow designation classified Inner Asian tribes into different groups based on linguistic affiliation. In contrast, modern historians virtually use *Turk* as a synonym for all Turkic-speaking peoples and differentiate them from non-Turkic-speaking peoples. Therefore, I argue that interpreting or understanding the Turkic identity of the nomadic peoples of pre-modern Inner Asia in the modern sense would be tantamount to defining the crusaders as French on the basis that the Arabic term for the Crusaders was *Ifranj* and that the *lingua franca* in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem was Old French.

In Mongol and post-Mongol Central Asia, the term *Turk* was used by and for the Mongols and their Turkicised descendants as a designation in accordance with the

appears as the ancestor of the Ottomans. See Paul Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: B. Franklin, 1971), 39.

172 According to Bernard Lewis, the Turkic identity of the Ottomans began to disappear from the mid-fifteenth century. Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 331–33. Consequently, the Ottoman elite viewed the Turks as “unruly and uneducated low-class soldiers from Anatolia, and also regarded them as foreigners in relation to themselves”. See Ulrich W. Haarmann, “Ideology and History, Identity and Alterity: The Arab Image of the Turk from the Abbasids to Modern Egypt”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 20, no. 2 (1988), 177. Furthermore, Ottoman writers used the term *Turk* disrespectfully, often with the modifiers “ignorant” or “dishonest”. See Caroline Finkel, *Osman’s Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300–1923* (London: John Murray, 2005), 548. Evliya Çelebi, for instance, viewed the Anatolian Turks as unrefined bumpkins. Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi* (Boston: Brill, 2004), 64.

long-standing Muslim practice of classifying Inner Asian tribes into the category of *Turk*. Therefore, this article argues that the identification of the Mongols with the Turks made by various Muslim writers should not be understood as reflecting the Turkicisation of the former. Significantly, in Mongol and post-Mongol Central Asia and Iran, *Turk* was a term relational to *Tajik*, meaning the sedentary Iranian population, not an antonym of *Mongol*. Accordingly, *Turk* was not used as a designation by and for the Mongols and their Turkicised descendants in the Qipchaq Steppe, where most of its inhabitants were nomads. For the same reason, the Turkicised descendants of the Mongols in post-Mongol Central Asia, including the Timurids and the Uzbek Chinggisids, could continue to view themselves as Mongols while using *Turk* as a self-designation.

Finally, the main claim of the dynastic genealogies that trace Chinggis Khan and Temür's descent from Turk Khan, son of Japheth, through such figures as Mughül Khan and Alan Qo'a was that the Mongols and their descendants belonged to the most prominent branch of Inner Asian nomads. This article accordingly argues that the Turkic identity reflected in the histories and the dynastic genealogies produced in various Chinggisid and Timurid states in Central Asia and Iran was as a unique expression of pride in Chinggisid lineage.

This article attempted to clarify the nature of the Turkic identity of the Chinggisid and Timurid elites in post-Mongol Central Asia by bringing together a broad range of primary sources from a culturally and linguistically diverse source base and providing a synoptic view of the question at a level of detail that has been previously unavailable. I thus hope that this article will at least serve as a history of the unlikely metamorphosis of the term *Turk* from a name for a single confederation to an umbrella term embracing peoples that came to span Eurasia.