

half of the 7th cent., is not ambiguous and makes it probable that the other and more usual transcription Ta-shih is to be restored as \*T'âi-zi and represents also the form Tāzī, not Tājik.

The word has been supposed to occur in 732 in the Turkish inscription of Kül-tāgin (cf. BARTHOLD, in RADLOV, *Die alttürk. Inschr. der Mongolei*, Zweite Folge, 12); the passage is however illegible. But two epigraphic mentions have been found in other Turkish monuments of the 8th cent., in the form Tājik. It seems that in both cases Tājik is not taken in the sense of « Arab », but already in that of « Persian » which, owing to the conversion of Persia to Islam, it soon took and has since retained in Central Asia (cf. SAMOÏLOVIČ, in *Doklady Ak. Nauk*, B, 1927, 155-156; KOTWICZ and SAMOÏLOVIČ, in *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, iv, 101-102). Kāšyārī, writing in 1076, gives *Tāzik* as meaning « Persian » (BROCKELMANN, 250). Both forms « Tāzik » and « Tazi » occur in the *Qutaḡyū bilig* of 1069 and SAMOÏLOVIČ may be right in supposing that they still retained at that time two different meanings, « Tāzik » meaning « Persian » and « Tazi » meaning « Arab ». As a matter of fact, « Tazi », with the specific meaning of « Arab », still occurs in Turkish literature as late as the beginning of the 14th cent. (RADLOV, III, 930). As *tazī* or *tazi*, it survives now in Turkish only as the name of the « greyhound », literally « the Arabian [dog] ». This Turkish use of Tazi, rather than Tāzik or Tājik, in the sense of « Arab » seems to confirm the view that the Chinese transcriptions are really based only on « Tāzī ».

Until the destruction of the Abbasid caliphate in 1258, Bagdad remained for the Chinese the centre of the Mussulman world. Mecca appears for the first time as a separate country in the *Hsi shih chi* of 1259 in which it is called 天房 T'ien-fang, « Heavenly house » (cf. *Br*, I, 141). Also under the Yüan, the *Tao-i chih-liao* of 1349-1350 describes it under the name of 天堂 T'ien-t'ang, « Paradise », with a note saying that the ancient name was 筠冲 Yün-ch'ung. That « ancient name », which does not appear to be a transcription from a foreign language, has not so far been discovered in any earlier Chinese text; but the information was taken over about eighty years later by the *Hsing-ch'a shêng-lan*. On the other hand, the *Hsing-ch'a shêng-lan*, like all the other works of the Ming dynasty, does not call Mecca T'ien-t'ang, but 天方 T'ien-fang, which may mean « Heavenly country » or « Heavenly square » (cf. ROCKHILL, in *TP*, 1915, 618-620). BRETSCHNEIDER was probably right when he thought (*Br*, II, 303) that the two forms of T'ien-fang and the one of T'ien-t'ang all refer to the Great Mosque of Mecca, to the square Ka'bah, also called Bāitullah, « House of God ». But one would like to know more about the history of these different Chinese names (cf. also *TP*, 1933, 445).

## 27. ARAINES

*araines* F

BENEDETTO and MOULE are of course right when they reject YULE's *harem*; on the other hand, I agree with MOULE when he thinks that BENEDETTO's emendation to *le serores* is palaeographically very improbable (cf. Vol. I, 452). I have since thought of another solution, perhaps