

and Toloman and also many other provinces named above» (Vol. I, 366); or, in other words, that Toloman is only part of an incomplete enumeration of the provinces of Yün-nan, and his statement would appear more correct if he had named Caragian instead of or, at least, as well as Toloman.

364. TOMAN

<i>chumano</i> (-i) V	<i>thoman</i> Z	<i>toman</i> F, FA, L; R
<i>comanus</i> G	<i>toma</i> (-i), <i>tottamanni</i> TA ³	<i>tomano</i> (-i) TA ¹
<i>comman</i> (-s) FB	<i>tomain</i> F, L	<i>tomay</i> LT
<i>tamain</i> F	<i>tomam</i> (-i) VA	<i>toumau</i> (-x) FA
<i>teman</i> VB	<i>tomamus</i> P	<i>tumani</i> VB, VL

This is the Persian pronunciation of تومان, which is Turk. and Mong. *tümän*, « ten thousand »; Rubrouck has *tumen* (*Wy*, 271); Odoric writes *tuman* (*Y*¹, II, 198-199; *Wy*, 465); *tumen* is in the *Codex Cumanicus*, 146, 290 (where KUUN quotes also *töméntelen*, *tömeny ezer*, « myrias », « chalias », « multa millia »). The Jučen had the word as *tuman* or *tümän*, and it occurs even in the Tungusian languages. On account of Old Slaw *tūma*, « ten thousand », and Russian *těmnik*, « commander of 10,000 », and of « Tokh. » *tmān*, Kuchean *tumane*, *tmane*, « ten thousand », the question has been raised whether the word is originally Indo-European or Altaic, and even Chin. 萬 *wan* (**mj^wɔn*) may be brought eventually into line as a very old borrowing (but not as the etymology of *tümän*, as RAMSTEDT supposed in *JFSO*, XXIX, 22). I incline to think that the word is Indo-European, and has been borrowed by the Altaic languages; but Persian *toman* seems to have been in turn borrowed from Turkish or Mongolian in the Middle Ages, although the word is said to have existed in Khwārēzmian. Cf. LAUFER, in *TP*, 1915, 276-281, and my remarks in *TP*, 1931, 448-449. LAUFER has also maintained (*TP*, 1915, 277) that Pers. *toman*, as the name of a coin, had nothing to do with *tümän*, contrary to YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 928-929; but YULE was right (cf. VULLERS, I, 482-483).

Rašidu-'d-Dīn says that the commanders of ten thousand were called « *wanshi* », and YULE (*Y*¹, III, 120) has given Chin. *wan*, « 10,000 », as the first element of the term; this is a mistake; Rašid's form must be read *wanšai* (also written *wangšai*) and represents 元帥 *yüan-shuai*, « commander of an army ». Cf. *Bl*, II, 471, and App. 46, where BLOCHET, like YULE, thinks of *wan*, and is absolutely wrong in saying that *wan* was anciently pronounced *wang*; cf. also my remarks in *TP*, 1930, 43.

Tümän has really been employed as a technical term for a corps of 10,000 men (cf. the edict of 1347 quoted by YULE (*Y*, I, 264) and VULLERS, I, 482-483), but not as the title of its commander; in the Mongol edicts, such a commander is simply called a *noyan*.

In his excellent notice « Tuman » of the *EI*, BARTHOLD has expressed the opinion that *tümän* originally meant « many », and did not occur with the meaning of « 10,000 » before the Mongol period. His main argument is that, in Kāšgarī (I, 337; not in BROCKELMANN), we had only *tümän türlük*, « de manière très variée », and *tümän ming* meaning not « 10,000,000 » as might be expected, but only « 1 000 × 1 000 » = 1 million. But, even if we leave aside the « Tokharian » forms, it