

UDC / UDC 903.22, 623.445
DOI: 10.22162/2500-1523-2021-2-186-221



Weapons and banners of the Muslim population of East Turkestan and adjacent territories in the mid-18th century according to the Qingding Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi

*Leonid Alexandrovich Bobrov*¹, *Alexei Mikhailovich Pastukhov*²

¹ Novosibirsk State University (v. 1, Pirogov St., 630090 Novosibirsk, Russian Federation)
D. in History, Associate Professor, Leading Researcher  0000-0001-5071-1116 E-mail: spsml@mail.ru

² Novosibirsk State University (v. 1, Pirogov St., 630090 Novosibirsk, Russian Federation)
Humanities Laboratory Engineer
 0000-0003-0151-1796. E-mail: chinese warfare@inbox.ru

© KalmNTs RAS, 2021

© L.A. Bobrov, A.M. Pastukhov, 2021

Annotation. *Introduction.* This article is devoted to the armament and military symbols of the Muslim (*Huibu*) population on the territory of the Dzungarian state in the last third of the 17th - middle of the 18th centuries in the Qingding Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi Qin source. This section of the Qingdin Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi was not previously translated into Russian and did not become the object of a separate scholarly research. *The aim of the study is to introduce into the scientific context and to study the data of tszüan42 "Qindin Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi" concerning armament and banners of Muslim population of Dzungaria and Eastern Turkestan. Results.* The work under consideration was compiled on the initiative of the Qianlong emperor based on the results of annexing the territory of the Dzungarian state to the Qing Empire. A group of Qing officials and European specialists was sent to study the new lands. The main research work in Dzungaria was done in 1756-1757. The study of Eastern Turkestan was completed in the spring of 1759. In the same year, work on the text began, which continued, with interruptions, for 23 years (1759-1782). It was written by Manchu military commanders who participated in military operations in Central Asia, among others. The source described three types of "Muslim" bladed weapons (*kylych*, *salem*, and *khanjar*), a lance (*nayza*), an axe (*aibalta*), a bow (*yay*), arrows (*ok*), a quiver (*saadak*), chain armour (*sauyt*), plated armour (*kuyak*), soft armour (*olbog*), and mirror armour (*char-aina*),

History

helmet (*duulga*), and plate belt (*beldemchi*). The underpants and upper trousers - *shalbars* - are the most noteworthy elements of military costume. Besides, two different kinds of battle flags are described: *alam*, small banners of beks; "big banner", *tug*. The description of each item is accompanied by a transcription of its original name. In some cases material and main standard sizes are given. *Conclusions.* Comparison of the "Qingding Huangyu Xiu tuzhi" with authentic weapons and image materials shows that the imperial officials were quite accurate in describing the construction and design of weapons and armor of the peoples of the region. Some information from the source is unique and cannot be found in other works of the 18th century. The Qing authors correlated original names of weapons and armor with their design features, which opens wide prospects for a more detailed and comprehensive study of written works and epic of Turkic population in Central Asia.

Keywords: "Qingding Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi", East Turkestan, Jungaria, weapons, armour, banners

Acknowledgement. The study was conducted within the framework of the state assignment of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Project No. FSUS-2020-0021).

For citation: Bobrov L.A., Pastukhov A.M. Armament and banners of Muslim population of East Turkestan and adjacent territories in the middle of XVIII century according to "Qingding Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi" // Mongolian Studies. 2021. T. 13. № 2. C. 186-221. DOI: 10.22162/2500-1523-2021-2-186-221

Weapons and Banners of Moslem Population in East Turkestan and Adjacent Territories, Mid-18th Century: A Case Study of *Qinding Huangyu Xiyu Tuzhi*

Leonid A. Bobrov¹, Alexey M. Pastukhov²

¹ Novosibirsk State University (1, Pirogov St., 630090 Novosibirsk, Russian Federation)
Dr. Sc. (History), Leading Research Associate, Associate Professor

 0000-0001-5071-1116. E-mail: spsml@mail.ru

² Novosibirsk State University (1, Pirogov St., 630090 Novosibirsk, Russian Federation)
Engineer, Humanities Research Laboratory

 0000-0003-0151-1796. E-mail: chinese warfare@inbox.ru

© KalmSC RAS, 2021

© Bobrov L. A., Pastukhov A. M., 2021

Abstract. *Introduction.* The article deals with the *juan* (chapter) 42 of the Qing source "Qinding Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi" written in the second half of the 18th century and devoted to the weapons and banners of the Muslim population (*Huibu*) of the former Dzungar state. The chapter has not been previously translated into European languages and has not been the object of a special study either. *The purpose of the research* is to examine and introduce this new data for scholarly attention and further inquiry. *Results.* The compilation of the document was initiated by Emperor Qianlong after the territory of the Dzungar state was annexed to the Qing Empire. A group of Qing officials and of European specialists was sent to explore the newly acquired lands. The work in Dzungaria was largely carried out in 1756-1757, while the study of East

Turkestan was completed in the spring of 1759. The work on the text itself began the same year to continue for about 23 years (1759-1782). Manchu military leaders who participated in the war in Central Asia took part in the compilation of the document, too. The chapter under study describes three types of bladed weapons of the Muslim population in the region (*kılıç*, *selem*, *hançer*), spear (*naiza*), ax (*aibalta*), bow (*yay*), arrows (*ok*), quiver (*saadak*), chain mail (*sauyt*), plate armor (*kuyak*), quilted soft armor (*olbog*), mirror armor (*charayna*), helmet (*duulga*), and plate belt (*beldemchi*). Special attention was given to such parts of military suits as quilted liners of helmets and upper trousers (*shalbars*). Also, two types of battle banners are described in detail, such a *salam*, the small banner of *beys* and *tug*, a big banner. Each item is supplied with a description and the transcription of its original name. In some cases, the material used for their manufacture and typical sizes are indicated.

Conclusions. The data of the written source under study compared with authentic samples of weapons and pertaining visual materials has shown that the Qing officials described the weapons and banners of the region with high degree of reliability. Some of this information is unique and can be found in no other sources of the period. The authors pointed out correlations between the original names of the weapons and armor with their constructive features, which opens new avenues for further research of the written works and epics of the Turkic population of Central Asia. **Keywords:** "Xiyu Tuzhi", East Turkestan, Dzungaria, weapons, armor, banners **Acknowledgements.** The reported study was funded by state assignment (Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Russia), project no. FSUS-2020-0021.

For citation: Bobrov L. A., Pastukhov A. M. Weapons and Banners of Moslem Population in East Turkestan and Adjacent Territories, Mid-18th Century: A Case Study of *Qinding Huangyu Xiyu Tuzhi*. *Mongolian Studies (Elista)*. 2021; 13(2): 186-221. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.22162/2500-1523- 2021-2-186-221.

Introduction

In the second half of the 1950s, the long-standing conflict between the Jungar state and the Qing Empire ended in favour of the latter. The Jungar Empire was joined to the Celestial Empire, a vast area of Central Asia with a large Mongol- and Turkic-speaking population. To manage the new territories more effectively, maps had to be drawn and the new boundaries of the empire demarcated, and the administrative and social structure, as well as the history and the material and spiritual culture of the people, had to be studied. The Manchu authorities were interested in the armament and military affairs of the Oirat and the Muslim subjects of Dzungaria, who resisted the Qing army, among other matters.

A special expedition was dispatched to the region to carry out this task. The decree was issued on 25 March 1755, even before the Qing troops had captured the Ili River valley, the political centre of Dzungaria. In addition to high-ranking Qing officials, the expedition included European specialists. The obtained data was supposed to be systematised, analysed and eventually published in the form of a separate work addressed to the representatives of the ruling elite of the Qing Empire, as well as to the civil servants of different levels [Bobrov, Pastukhov 2021: 510-517]. The main initiator and inspirer of the expedition was the Emperor Qianlong himself (reign: 1735-1796).

History

As a special study has shown, the main work on the collection of information on the territory of Dzungaria was carried out in 1756-1757. The study of East Turkestan was completed in the spring of 1759. In the same year, based on the collected data, work on the text began, which lasted, with interruptions, for 23 years (1759-1782). Among those who worked on the work were Manchu military commanders, veterans of fighting in Central Asia: Agui, Zhaohui, Shuhede, and others, who were directly involved in battles against the Junggarian Oirat and the Muslims of East Turkestan. A woodblock print edition of the 'Tsindin Huangyu Siyu tuzhi' ('The Imperially Approved Description of the Western Region with Maps') was published in 1782. It is a very important document [Bobrov, Pastukhov 2021: 510-517].

In assessing *Siyu tuzhi*¹ as a historical source, this is the most extensive, comprehensive, and detailed study of Central Asia among all Chinese works from the Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern periods. This is due in no small part to the special treatment accorded to this work by the Qianlong Emperor. The ruler of the Celestial Empire personally supervised the text's production and approved the leadership of the commissions that produced the work. Particular emphasis was placed on the accuracy of the information. Much of the information was gathered directly from the local population, including Oirat and Turkic feudal lords well versed in the specifics of their subordinate lands. This was done in 1756-1759, i.e. almost immediately after the incorporation of Dzungaria and Eastern Turkestan into the Qing state, when memories of the sovereign period of the "Last Nomadic Empire" were still fresh. The collected data were verified and clarified by the Qing military and civil officials [Bobrov and Pastukhov 2021: 510-517].

These facts demonstrate the high scientific value of "However, one should bear in mind that this work is a complex, multidimensional work in which current information from the field is interspersed with inserts from earlier Chinese historical chronicles, as well as other materials [Bobrov, Pastukhov 2021: 517].

In historiographical perspective, the materials of the "Siyu tuzhi" were repeatedly used by researchers in the study of the history of the peoples of the "Western Region"² of the first half to the middle of the XVIII century. However, the various information contained in this work, were attracted very unevenly. For example, if the data on the socio-administrative structure and economy of Dzungaria were actively analyzed and published in scientific

¹ This shortened version of the title is confirmed by its mention in imperial decrees, while the title *Qingding* (approved by the Emperor) was given to this work in 1782.

² *Xiyu* (西域, Western Region) is the ancient name for the territories of Gansu and Xinjiang provinces. The term *Sichui* (西陲), i.e. "Western outskirts", was also used to refer to these territories.

In addition, some other sections of the *Siyu Tuzhi* have not been the subject of scholarly research for a long time. This includes information on weapons, armour and banners of the Muslim population of East Turkestan and neighbouring territories.

The aim of the study is to introduce and examine the Jiuan 42

"This section of the work has not previously been translated into Russian and has not been the subject of a separate scholarly study. This section of the work has not been previously translated into Russian and did not become the subject of a separate scientific study. However, these materials are of great interest to archaeologists, military historians, weapons scientists, and ethnographers studying the military and cultural heritage of the peoples of the region of the late Middle Ages and early Modern Age.

Materials and methods

The main methodological basis for weapons research is the principles of historicism, objectivity, and the systematic approach, which consists in the holistic consideration of a set of objects, in which it is found that their interrelationship leads to the emergence of new integrative properties of the system. The systems approach uses the rational provisions of evolutionism (variability and heredity) and diffusionism (borrowing, transfer, mixing) [Bobrov, Ogeredov 2021: 12].

The methodology of source processing is determined by the objectives of the study. At the stages of analysis and interpretation of the materials, traditionally morphological, classification, typological, comparative-descriptive methods, the method of dated analogies, verification and correlation of the obtained results are used [Bobrov, Ogeredov 2021: 12].

Of particular value for the topic of our study is the information reported by the authors of *Siyu tuzhi* about the linear dimensions of weapons and military symbols of the peoples of the region. When converting length indicators into metric units we used Wu Chenglo's calculations according to which in Qing dynasty 1 *jang* was 3,2 m; 1 *bu* was 1,6 m; 1 *chi* was 32 cm; 1 *tsun* was 3,2 cm, 1 *fen* is 0.32 cm [Shkolyar 1980: 358; Bobrov, Pastukhov 2021: 508-510].

The Qing expeditions and commissions were not able to measure a large number of weapons of the Muslim population of the region and then to calculate their average size based on a representative sample. It is doubtful that members of Qing expeditions and commissions deliberately measured a large number of weapons of the Muslim population of the region and then calculated their average dimensions on the basis of a representative sample. The latter were probably established "by eye" in the course of inspecting captured war booty. It is this conventional value that is recorded in the document. Even with this correction, however, the information is of exceptional scholarly interest, as it is unparalleled in other written sources of the period in question.

Furthermore, the meaning of the term 回部 *huibu* ('mu-Sulman tribes') in the text '*Siyu tuzhi*'. In a narrow sense in the Qing materials devoted to the subjugation of the "Western Province", it usually meant the Muslim population of the Jungar state, in the first place the inhabitants of Eastern Turkestan. However, it is possible that the notion

History

"In the Siyu Tuzhi, "armament of Muslims" could be interpreted by the authors of the work in a broader sense, including to denote the armament complexes of those Turkic peoples that the Qing encountered on their new western frontiers during the conquest of Dzungaria. Among them were, for example, the Tian Shan Kirghiz. It is doubtful that the Qing officers examining the spoils of war could confidently distinguish between the Kyrgyz weapons and those of the contemporary Uighur ancestors³. During the suppression of the Amursana revolt, the Qing troops also encountered Kazakh units. In the Qing written materials of the 18th century the ethnic Kirghiz (*Bulute*) and Kazakhs (*Hasake*) are usually separated from the "Muslims" (*Huibu*). However, in synchronous "Siyu tuzhi" works (for example, "Huang Qing zhigun tu")

"Muslims" are mentioned among the subjects of the rulers of the Kazakh *zhuzes*⁴. Comparison of authentic samples of Kazakh armaments with descriptions from "Siyu tuchzhi" testifies to the similarity of their design and decoration system. It is highly probable that some types of weapons mentioned in the Qing source could be close or even identical to those of the Kazakhs of the Middle and Senior *Juz*.

**Information from Juan 42 "Xiyu tuzhi" on armaments and military symbols
The "Muslim tribes" of Central Asia in the mid-18th century.**

On some of the structural and substantive features of Juan 42 Xiyu tuzhi

The Siyu tuzhi text dedicates a paragraph to each item of weaponry, equipment, and military insignia, informing the reader of the original name of the item in question. This is followed by a brief description of the item. In some cases, the compilers of the Siyu tuzhi specify the material used and the main typical dimensions of the items in question.

The translations of the relevant passages of the Siyu tuzhi⁵ have been extensively commented by the authors of this study, comparing the Siyu tuzhi with other written, as well as physical and pictorial information.

³ The Kyrgyz have been constant participants in the political struggle in East Turkestan since the sixteenth century, supporting various pretenders to the throne of the Yarkand Khanate. In 1754, the Kyrgyz supported the Montenegrin *Khojas* in their attempt to gain independence from the Dzungars. However, in 1755-1756 they already supported the White *Khojas* against their Montenegrin opponents. In 1758-1759 the Kirghiz began fighting with the White *Khojas* again, partly under the pressure of the Tsins and partly because of political disputes between the Kirghiz *biys* and the White *Khojas*.

⁴ For a considerable part of the 18th century Kazakhs controlled the Syr Darya towns, which were home to a relatively large (by the standards of the region) sedentary Muslim population. It should also be noted that the inhabitants of Maverannahr and Afghanistan are also referred to as "Muslims" in Qing sources, sometimes specifying in which state or city they lived.

⁵ The original text of the Siyu tuzhi is highlighted in italics to make it easier to read. The translation from Chinese was made by A. M. Pastukhov from the woodcut edition published in scanned form on the website cctext.org [CCST 1782: tsz. 42].

The approach makes it possible to assess the degree of accuracy of Qing officials' reports. Such an approach makes it possible to assess the degree of authenticity of Qing officials' reports, which is important for determining the scientific value of "Siyu tuzhi" in studying the armament of the Muslim population of Dzungaria, Eastern Turkistan and their neighbours of the first half to the middle of the 18th century.

In addition to the basic information describing the weaponry and military symbology of the *huibu*, the text of Siyu tuzhi includes poems by the Qianlong emperor on the "Muslim sword" (*huijian*) and the "Muslim banner" (*huidu*). It is hoped that these poetic insertions will be translated and analyzed in a special scholarly study.

Translation of Juan 42 "Xiyu tuzhi" on armaments and military symbols of the "Muslim tribes" of Central Asia in the mid-18th century.

Juan 42. Clothing and utensils². Muslim tribes (Huibu) <...> Armament (Gongzhan zhi jiu)⁶

"Kalinci (克凌齊)⁷. Saber (Chinese Dao 刀).⁸ Their material is pure copper (chundong 純銅). Their shape is curved, and at the tip especially strong. The handle is made of large fish bone (daiygu 大魚骨) and hard wood (inmu 硬木). The scabbard is made of fish skin (kitsch yupi 魚皮) and decorated with ivory (kitsch xianya 象牙) and tortoise shell (kitsch daimao 玳瑁). At the end of the hilt there is a copper a ring to which a leather cord is tied. [CCST 1782: tsz. 42].

Obviously, by *kelinci* in the text "Siyu tuzhi" is meant the word *klynch/kylych/klych* (YTL. *qilič* [DTS 1969: 442], tur. *kılıç* [TRS 1977: 539]. In the Late Middle Ages and New Age this term was used by the Turkic-speaking population of Eurasia to denote a long bladed weapon. In a narrow sense, it could be used as a synonym for a sabre or even some special varieties of it.

Judging by the description, in "Siyu tuzhi" *kalinci* refers to sabers with a strong curved blade. For example, sabers of fore-Asian type (*shamshir*) and their local derivatives popular among Kazakhs and Uzbeks in the 18th century can be referred to them. This weapon was equipped with a strongly curved blade, the maximum bend of which was observed on the lower third of the saber strip (closer to the tip). The handles of Central Asian *shamshirs* were often equipped with plated "cheeks" made of wood and walrus fang, which the authors of "Siyu tuzhi" apparently attributed to "bones of a big fish" [Bobrov, Ismailov and Ismailov, 2005]. [Bobrov, Ismailov 2019: 154, 155].

The tips of the handles of *shamshir* and other varieties of Muslim sabres were sometimes supplemented with a metal ring, which could be both movable and stationary [The Arts... 2008: 58, 100, 101, 104, 105; Rivkin, Isaac 2017: 134, 135, 186, 187]. In the latter case it often framed a through hole in the hilt, into which a cloth or leather

⁶ Lit. 'utensils, [to go] into an offensive battle'.

⁷ Hereinafter the Chinese spelling is indicated in parentheses.

⁸ The word *Dao* (刀) in the Qing documents of the mid 18th century was used to denote weapons with a single blade, including sabers, broadswords, knives, cleavers, etc. The context of this message shows that it refers to a sabre.

History

The Arts... 2008: 28, 60, 62, 66; Rivkin and Isaac 2017: 189, 231]. It is highly probable that these very elements are described in the text as a "brass ring to which a leather cord is tied". [TSPC 1782: tsz. 42].

The sheaths of sabers of the Muslim East were usually covered with leather, fabric or thin metal sheet. In some cases they were decorated with scales [Rivkin, Isaac 2017: 182]⁹. However, among the specimens known to us no ornaments of such materials as ivory and tortoise shell have been recorded yet.

The statement that the sabers in question could have been made of "pure copper" should be regarded as one of the obvious errors. The handles of Muslim knives were often equipped with guards and tips of a copper alloy, but the material for the blades was always iron (steel)¹⁰.

"Selima (色里葉瑪). Also a saber/palash (dao 刀). The kelinzi (fang. -L. B., A. P.) has a thin blade. In salem, the blade is usually thicker. Its shape is slightly [elongated as] a rectangle, and the handle is very long. Those who are very strong use an iron hilt". [CCST 1782: tsz. 42].

Selima translates the Mongolian word *selme (selme, seleme¹¹)*, which is usually translated as "sabre". [Pyrbeev 2009: 284]. The materials of Siyu tuzhi, at first sight, confirm this version. The Qing authors confidently correlate *seliema* with *Tao* and compare it with *kelinzi*, i.e. a *fang*, with its curved single-bladed blade.

At the same time, *the saliema* has certain design features. In particular, it differs from *the fang* in having a thicker blade and a "very long" hilt. The shape of the blade is compared with a "slightly" elongated "rectangular". [CCST 1782: tsz. 42], which is more typical for a slightly curved Central and East Asian saber, as well as a palash with a straight single-bladed blade.

The Mongolian-speaking contemporaries also often distinguished *sulams* from ordinary sabers. For example, the Oirat Taisha Chokur, listing his military skills to the Russian ambassador P.Kulvinsky, reported in 1667: "I don't know whether I can't shoot with a pistol or don't know whether I can't use a saber or a *sulm* (here and further italics is ours. - *Auth.*)? [Russo-Mongolian relations 1996: 154]. A legitimate question arises - what kind of long-blade weapons is hidden under the name *seliema/sulema*?

In the reports of European contemporaries, *sulema* is a weapon of Oirat, Mongolian and Qing warriors, often with a relatively short (by

⁹ It is also possible that by "fish skin" the Qing authors meant stingray skin. Such a coating was used to decorate Central and East Asian bladed weapons of the late Middle Ages and early Modern period.

¹⁰ It is very likely that there was a mechanical error on the part of the carver of the xylograph board, who carved "copper" (銅) instead of "iron" (鐵).

¹¹ It is interesting that the Chinese transcription of *seleema* is similar in sound to the Russian versions of this Mongolian-speaking term in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. - The Chinese pronunciation of *eelema* is similar to the Russian variants of this Mongolian-speaking term in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In modern Mongolian, the final words lose their vowels. What sounded like *selam* in the seventeenth century is now pronounced *selam* in the twentieth century.

compared to their European counterparts) with a slightly curved or straight single-bladed blade. For example, Jury Krizhanich, who during 1661-1676 was in exile in Tobolsk, compared them to pikes, emphasising straight and short blade of Oiratian *sulims*: "They were fighting with arrows and *sabres*, but shorter than ours, and not bent: they may be compared with the Roman *sicca*, which they themselves called *sulims*". [Bobrov, Khudjakov 2008: 271].

The Russian ambassador N. G. Spafary-Milescu (1636-1708), who visited the Qing Empire in 1676, compared Qing *sulams* with European sabres, noting their shorter blade in comparison with their western analogues: "... and equestrian [warriors have] a *sulam*, similar to our sabres, only shorter and worse in iron...". [Bobrov, Khudjakov 2008: 271]¹².

The description and picture of weapons *selebe* (Kazakh pronunciation of the word *selam* borrowed from Mongolian peoples), made by the Russian officer and traveler of the 19th century Ch. Valikhanov clarifies to some extent the question of interest: "Kirghiz themselves made long knives, or better, half-sabers, straight and called them *selebe* or *jekeauz*; *jekeauz* was somewhat shorter. Both the *selebe* and *jekeauz* had only one nut or ring to be worn on the belt, which was attached to the very top of the sheath. On the handle there was also a ring for the knot". [Valikhanov 1961: 463-467].

According to Valikhanov's drawing, *the selebe* was a type of cleaver. It had a wide, but relatively short blade with a straight butt and a blade, smoothly converging to the tip. A ring for the shackle was attached to the upper part of the hilt, devoid of guard. Also known *selebe* equipped with a massive straight or slightly curved blade and a metal hilt, which correlates well with the Siyu tuzhi information about the thickness of the blade and the "iron hilt" of the examined weapon [CCST 1782: tsz. 42]. The obvious difference between Valikhanov's *selebe* and the description of *selieum* in the text "Siyu tuzhi" is that *the selebe* usually had a standard hilt, while the Qing authors emphasized its considerable length.

Nevertheless, there are mentions of *sleebes* with a two-handed hilt in written material. For example, the latter are present on some Qin sabers, including the weapons of soldiers of the Qin emperor's guard of honor (Ch. *lubu* 鹵簿).

Probably, it was these sabers of the bodyguard of the ruler of the Celestial Empire that Spatharius described in the article list of his embassy, identifying them as "great gilded *sulemas* with two handles".

[RKO 1972: 397].

Similar sabers with a gilded instrument (kint. *yidao* 儀刀) survived in the arms of imperial guards in the 18th century as well. [HLT 2004: 452]. Similar, but much more modestly shaped weapon with a two-handed hilt was used also by common Qin saber guards of the period under consideration [XLT 2004: 715-718; Deadly beauty 2015: 262 (Fig. 198)].

¹² It should be taken into consideration that the average length of seventeenth-century European sabres (c. 70-80 cm) exceeded the length of Central and East Asian swords (c. 60-70 cm), which to a great extent determined the frequent information about "short" (in comparison with European ones) blades of Central and continental East Asia [Bobrov, Khudjakov 2008: 271].

History

In favor of the possibility that warriors of Dzungaria and East Turkestan used weapons with long hilt, there is also evidence of swords of the XVII-XIX centuries originating from the territory of the North-West China bordering with them. Some of them were equipped with one-and-a-half hilt length of about 20 cm [[Deadly beauty 2015: 328-330](#)].

The above information suggests that by *seliyama* the Qing authors of Siyu tuzhi probably meant a type of long-bladed weapon with a single-bladed straight or slightly curved solid blade and a long hilt¹³. Thus, this category could include both broadswords and weakly curved sabers as well as cleavers with a shortened straight or curved thick blade¹⁴. In some cases, *the saliem* could have a "iron hilt", which significantly increased the weight of the weapon, so only "very strong" warriors could use it in combat, according to the compilers of Siyu tuzhi¹⁵.

Kazakh *selebes* of the first half - middle of the XIX c., as a rule, had no gardas. However, regarding Dzungarian and East Turkestan *seliyems* the question can not be solved equally unequivocally. The source we study does not mention anything about the construction of the hilt of *the saliem*s. In Qing paintings from the second half of the 18th c. Dzungarian broad-bladed sabers and broad-bladed swords are usually equipped with a rounded *hosho* guard, which, however, does not exclude the use of other designs. This is confirmed by Central and East Asian swords and sabers of XVII-XIX cc., equipped with one-and-a-half- and two-handed hilt and disc-shaped, cross-shaped, elongated-rhombic and shaped hards [[HLT 2004: 452, 715-718](#); [Deadly beauty 2015: 328-330](#)].

Considering that the parameters of *salem* specified in Siyu tuzhi fit a variety of long-legged weapons originating from Central, Central and South Asia, we can assume that this group could include various sabers (mainly with a relatively short, slightly curved blade), swords, and cleavers, both of Dzungarian, Tibetan, South Siberian and Muslim manufacture.

¹³ As mentioned above, the term *Dao* was used in Qing materials of the 18th century to denote single-bladed weapons, i.e. both swords and broadswords.

¹⁴ This attribution is confirmed by both contemporary reports and Qing pictorial materials of the second half of the 18th c. It is interesting that similar attribution of *the suluba*, but based on the analysis of 17th c. Russian inventories, was made by S.P. Orlenko, R.R. Novoselov and S.S. Kurmanovskiy: "Possibly the term was applied as an adjective for a type of sword or cleaver which was notable for its heavy amplification. P. Orlenko, V.R. Novoselov and V.S. Kurmanovskiy: "Perhaps the term was applied as an adjective to a type of sword or cleaver which had a heavier, broader and thicker blade and was intended mainly for cutting and chopping blows" [Orlenko & Novoselov 1999, p. 132]. [[Orlenko, Novoselov, Kurmanovskii 2019: 5](#)].

¹⁵ What exactly was meant by "iron hilt" in Siyu tuzhi is not entirely clear. On authentic articles of Central, West Asian, South Asian and Central Asian weapons (and on their Qing imitations as well) one can find both cast all-metal hilt and handles covered with iron plates or wires [[Armaments and Military 2008: 146, 167](#); [The Arts... 2008: 71, 80, 84, 89, 100, 101, 104](#); [Rivkin, Isaac 2017: 195, 207](#)].

At the end of the review we should note that in the Mongolian military and cultural environment the term *selam* could probably be used in a broader sense. In particular, as a synonym for "saber" in general (without regard to the length and massiveness of the blade), which was fixed in the materials of ethnographic time. However, the question of the breadth of the Mongols' use of the term *selam* to designate all varieties of sabers in the pre-Tsin period requires additional study.

"*Naizah* (鼈哨). *A long spear (Changqiang 長鎗). Its shaft is about 1 zhang (about 3.2 m). Its iron tip is 7-9 tsun (22.4-28.8 cm). On the shaft and on the tip are copper rings for beauty, separated by [rings of] oxhide about 1 qun (about 3.2 cm) wide. Along the length of the staff is wound a leather [strap] in 9 coils*". [CCST 1782: tsz. 42].

"Naytza" is a fairly accurate transcription of the name of a spear in many Turkic languages - *nayza*. In the opinion of modern scholars of weaponry, the distinctive feature of the *naiza* spear, in comparison with the *sunga* spear, was a broader quill, designed mainly to hit the unarmed enemy [Akhmetjan 2007: 109, 110].

Despite the fact that the weapon in question is called a "long spear", at the same time it is, on average, somewhat shorter than a Dzungarian pike *jid* (Mong. *jad*, *žida*; Kalm. *æcid* [Dybo 2015: 221; BAMRS, 2 2001: 155; KIRS 1977: 226]) described in the Siyu tuzhi. If the latter was more than 3.2-4.1 m long, *the nayza* was about 3.4-3.5 m long (including the shaft about 3.2 m) [Bobrov and Pastukhov 2021: 518]. According to the Qing authors, *the naiza* was equipped with a longer tip: 22-29 cm, compared with 19-22 cm for the *jida*.

It is interesting to note that the compilers of the Siyu tuzhi note that the upper part of the *nayza* spear was decorated with copper rings, between which were rings of bull skin about 3.2 cm wide. It is possible that such a system was not only intended to decorate the weapon, but also to strengthen the upper part of the shaft. During the hand-to-hand fight this part of the spear, located under the tip, was the most vulnerable in a confrontation with an enemy using cutting and thrusting weapons [Bobrov 2013: 187, 190-192]. In addition, the shaft of the spear was reinforced by nine "coils [of belt] of leather"¹⁶.

The sizes of weapons mentioned in "Siyu tuchzhi" correspond on the whole to the sizes of spears and pikes of Muslim warriors in the Tsin pictures, scrolls and engravings of the second half of the 18th c. Material and graphic sources of the 18th - 19th cc. Also testify that spearheads and pikes of Eurasian steppe warriors could be reinforced by coils of iron wire, iron, bronze, copper rings (of different width and thickness), cylindrical "bracelets" and other metal elements.

There are also direct indications that the Kazakhs used long-stemmed weapons decorated with rings and wrapped with leather belts. Thus, for example

¹⁶ This description of the Siyu tuzhi prompts a different perspective on the numerous references in Central Asian epics to the "nine-knot" pika/kopja. While previously this was usually perceived as an artistic metaphor, the Qing source's account suggests that the wrapping of nine leather loops may have been a real element of the design of long-trunked nomadic weapons.

History

For example, the "favourite weapon" of Kenesar Kasymov's associate, batyr Agybai "... was a nine-knot pike, beautifully decorated with rings. It hung on a sturdy kulan leather belt" [[Bekmakhanov 1992: 186](#)].

Thus, the "Siyi tuzhi" information about spears of *naija* can be generally recognized trustworthy. However, we should note that Russian written sources of the 19th c. testify that Turkic warriors of Central and Middle Asia (for example Kazakhs and Uzbeks) could use both shorter and longer weapons. In addition, museum collections contain spearheads and spearheads of nomads from Kazakhstan and neighboring territories whose dimensions exceed the typical length of a *nayz* spearhead indicated in the Qing source.

"Aipaletu (阿伊帕勒圖). This is a moon axe (chit. yuefu 月斧)¹⁷. Cast iron (Chute 鑄鐵) is used to make an axe (Gan 幹)¹⁸. Its end is as sharp as a spear's. Near the sharp end, at a distance of 6-7 tsun (19.2-22.4 cm), an axe blade (Fumian 斧面) is made. The shape of the blade is semicircular on the bottom and very sharp on the top, elongated, like a rectangle. On the back side (chit bei 背)¹⁹ there are more than 20 teeth similar to those of a saw. In all respects an excellent thing, which can be used in various ways." [[CCST 1782: tsz. 42](#)].

The authors of Siyu tuzhi apparently meant the Turkic word *aibalta* (literally "moon-axe", "moon-shaped axe"). In its narrow sense, an axe in the 18th-19th centuries was a sort of axe equipped with a striker with a C-shaped (or moonshaped) blade, the ends of which were bent toward the axe. In a broad sense, the term *aibalta* was used as a synonym for a fighting axe in general (without regard to the shape of its blade). In the latter sense the term *aibalta* was also used in Siyu tuzhi.

Judging by the description of the blade shape ("the lower part of the blade is semicircular, very sharp, and the upper half is elongated, like a rectangle"), we are talking about a special kind of battle axe, often referred to as a "half-axe". Its distinguishing feature was the asymmetrical shape of the blade: the upper sharp-angled corner of the blade was turned away from the hilt (like a common *broadsword*), while the lower one was bent backwards, like an *aibalta* axe. According to some researchers such an axe had "a universal function of splitting, cutting and partially cutting". [[Akhmetjan 2007: 117, 118](#)].

The "half axes" are widely represented among the finds from West, Central and South Asia. The short-handled specimens were often used by members of the military elite, officials and bodyguards of the Muslim nobility. However, such weapons could also be equipped with a long ("cavalry") axe to allow efficient use of the axe during dynamic equestrian combat. The images of similar striking and cutting weapons are given on *the kulpytas* of Western Kazakhstan [[Akhmetjan 2007: 123 \(fig. 103, 3, 5\); Bobrov, Pronin 2014: 258 \(Fig. 33, 34\)](#)].

¹⁷ A literal translation of the Turkic term *aibalta* (see below). This refers to a percussive-cutting weapon with a C-shaped (moon-shaped) blade.

¹⁸ *Gan* - literally "rod". In this context it is the axe, the handle, the shaft of an axe. The term *gan* was also used in Qing China to refer to the shaft of an arrow.

¹⁹ *Bay* is a literal word for "back". "back".

According to the Qing authors' data, the length of the blade of this "axe-major" (from gut to blade) was 19-22 cm, which is somewhat longer than standard measures of asymmetric blades on similar striking and cutting weapons of the 19th century.²⁰ The axe-major was mounted on an iron hatchet, which was crowned with a spear-like tip. All-metal handles of axes are known both from materials of the Qing Empire and the Muslim East. In the latter case, however, the hilt had a wooden base, which was reinforced with iron elements (overlays, rings, "reapers", "bracelets"),

"The hilt was covered with metal sheet or foil [Bobrov 2015: 108 (figs. 1, 10); 110-112]. A handle decorated in such way could be mistaken for an iron, silver or golden one [Akhmetjan 2007: 123 (fig. 102, 7, 8), 124, 125 (fig. 105); Bobrov 2015: 109, (fig. 2, 2, 9-13)].

The lance-like tip mentioned in the text (transforming an axe into a halberd-like combined weapon on a shortened shaft) can also be found among authentic examples of Muslim weaponry of the late Middle Ages and early Modern Age. However, judging by the material and pictorial sources, such all-metal spear-shaped hilt is much less popular than the traditional types of axes.

The text notes that the "back" of the weapon had more than 20 "teeth", similar to the teeth of a saw. It remains unclear what is meant by the "back" of the battle axe: the striker's shank or the plate on the axe (*cut*)²¹. In the first case, the mentioned teeth (spikes?) could be located on the flattened or, on the contrary, hammer-shaped platform of the shank. In this case, the impact of the bludgeon could resemble the crushing impact of a spiked mace. If the teeth were placed on the edge of the sharpened cleaver blade, the impact would cause a laceration, which would bleed heavily. Such "saw-shaped" *incisions* were found on some varieties of Kazakh battle axes of the New Time [Akhmetzhan 2007: 123 (figure 102, 1); Bobrov 2015: 108 (figure 1, 7), 13), 109 (Figures 2, 4, 7), 112].

The authors of "Siyu tuzhi" were impressed by the versatile functionality of the described combined arms: "In all respects an excellent thing that can be used in different ways". [CCST 1782: tsz. 42]. Indeed, the presence of an asymmetric blade, spear-like tip and possibly a spiked shank allowed to inflict both cutting and stabbing, as well as stabbing and crushing blows on the enemy. However, only a strong, well-trained and experienced warrior was likely to be able to use the whole proposed range of combat elements effectively.

All in all, it can be stated that the Siyu tuzhi describes a striking but relatively rare type of "semi-siekiri" with an asymmetrical blade, iron

²⁰ It is possible that the above passage in Siyu tuzhi should be understood as the distance from the tip of the tip to the central part of the blade of the sekiri blade, which removes the above contradiction.

²¹ A *cut* is a sharpened iron plate of an elongated rectangular or elongated trapezoidal shape, riveted to the upper part of the shaft of a spear or a battle axe. The *cutback* prevented an opponent from intercepting the shaft or axe with his hand to deflect a blow. It also protects the supporting part of the weapon from being hit by an adversary. In some cases, a sharpened *snip* could be used as a weapon for cutting blows [Bobrov 2015: 112].

History

with a spear-shaped handle, with spikes on the butt or saw-shaped teeth on the *cut*²². Fighting axes were used by Dzungar warriors but were of very limited use among them. At the same time they were extremely popular among Kazakh and Kyrgyz nomads [Bobrov 2015: 107, 112, 113]. This, as well as the characteristic description of the design and system of weapons design, suggests that they were used predominantly by Turkic warriors among vassals and neighbours of Dzungaria.

"Hanjaer (罕札爾). It is a sword (Ch'iyān 劍). There are two spines (chī 脊)²³, fishbone (chī 魚骨) decorating the hilt. Highly compiled verses in [year under the cyclic signs] genchen (庚辰, 1760) on the Muslim sword (Chinese huiqian 回劍)...²⁴" [TSHST 1782: tsz. 42].

The Siyu tuzhi reproduces very accurately the Arabic name for the dagger, *khanjar*. A broad, curved or straight blade, sharpened on both sides, is usually referred to as a characteristic feature of this weapon. Near Asian *khanjars* and their local derivatives were often equipped with a massive hilt made of bull, elephant or deer bone. Hands made of walrus tusk were also very popular [Anisimova 2013: 151, 169].

Since the main reason for attributing bladed weapons in Qing China was the number of blades: one for a *Tao*, two for a *Jian*, the *hanjar*, being a double-bladed weapon, formally fell into the category of swords. As for "fishbone ornamentation", as we noted above, this probably refers to a walrus tusk, which was indeed often used to make the hilt of a *khanjar*.

Such weapons (both imported and made in Qing China according to sent samples) are widely represented in museum collections of the PRC, including the Museum of the Gugun Imperial Palace in Beijing. However, the majority of handles of such daggers are made not of bone, but of jade [Armaments and Military 2008: 175, 190].

*"Saote (纜特). Armour (kijia 甲). They are made like chainmail (jia 鎖子甲). Which are made of cotton are called **elepake/aolepake** (鄂勒帕克). Those that have plates²⁵, are called **kuyake** (庫雅克). Those with plates covering the heart (Chinese hushinjing 護心鏡) are called **chalaina** (察喇伊納) and are made of white iron (Chinese bayte 白鐵)²⁶. **Baledamuqi** (巴勒達木齊) is an iron belt (chit. tedai 鐵帶) on a shell." [TSHST 1782: tsz. 42].*

²² On most images and authentic objects, equipped with an iron hilt and a spear-like tip, the blade is of C-shape (saber-like) rather than asymmetric shape, and the blade is equipped with a shaped striker, an additional blade, a lance or decorative ornamentation [Khorasani 2006: 662; Anisimova 2013: 156]. On the other hand, "half-senes" almost never have a spear-like tip. In Qing paintings, engravings and scrolls Dzungarian, Uigur, Kazakh and Kirgiz warriors are mainly armed with ordinary axes with flattened spearheads and short or long wooden hilt.

²³ This refers to the two sides of the blade, which has an elongate-rhombic cross-section.

²⁴ This is followed by a poem by Emperor Qianlong, dedicated to the "Muslim sword" - *hui jian* (untranslated).

²⁵ *Jing* (鏡) means "mirrors".

²⁶ Perhaps tinned iron is meant.

In this section of the "Siyu tuzhi" the main varieties of body armament of Central and Central Asian warriors are listed: *sa- otae* (Turk. *sauyt*), *elepake* (Mong. *olbog*, *olboy*), *kuyake* (Mong. *huyag*, *quyay*, Kalm. *huyg*, Turk, Russian. *kuyak*), *chalaina* (Pers. *char-aina*), *baledamutsi* (Turk. *beldemchi*, *beldemči*) [Dybo 2015: 224, 243; KzRS: 99, 402; KIRS 1977: 531, 607; BAMRS, 2 2001: 467; BAMRS, 4 2002: 180; Egerton 2007: 181, 197, 198, 213, 242, 243, 260, 262, 265; SRJN 1981: 154; Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018: 70].

Saote (*sauyt*) is confidently correlated by Qing authors with a chain mail (*sojuja*). Judging by the materials of written sources and the epic of Turkic peoples, the term *sauyt* could be used in two main meanings. So, for example, it could be used to denote a body armor in general (without taking into account its armor structure). But in a narrow sense a *sauyt* usually meant a chain armor, sometimes with a specification: *kireuke sauyt* ('a ring/mesh armor'), *badana sauyt* ('the armor made of large flat rings'), or *kireuke sauyt* ('a chain armor') / *baidana*'), etc. [Akhmetzhan 2007: 130-132]. Thus, the interpretation of this term proposed by the compilers of *Siyu tuzhi* seems quite reliable.

The same can be said about *elepake* (*olbog*, *olboy*), which is traditionally attributed by researchers as a kind of "soft" quilted dospech [Purbeev 2009: 284].

It is interesting that both chainmail and quilted armour are mentioned twice in the *Siyu tuzhi*: first in *juan* 41, devoted to Dzungars, and then in *juan* 42, which tells about the armour of "Muslims". In the first case a Mongolian armour (*huyake* / *huyag*) was used to describe the chainmail, and in the second one a Mongolian one (*huyake* / *huyag*) was used.

- Turkic term (*saote* / *sauyt*), in the case of the organic protective armament the name *olbog* is repeated twice, but in different transcriptions.

In the sub-section of *Juan* 41 on Jungar armament, *the olbog* is given as *elleboke* or *aoleboke* (鄂勒博克). And in *juan* 42 it is as *elepake* or *aolepake* (鄂勒帕克). The first character was usually used to convey when transcribing the initialization "o" in foreign-language words. However, the characters *bo* 博 and *pa* 帕 are graphically significantly different and sound different. It is most likely that these differences in spelling resulted from the inclusion of primary field research data. It is possible that in this case, *Siyu tuzhi* was written by informants who had lived in different regions.

of the former Dzungarian state.

Indirect confirmation of this assumption are the mentioned types of padding of "soft" quilted armor. In the first case silk wool (綿) is used for this purpose, in the second case - cotton, cotton wool from cotton fleeces (棉). However, we should keep in mind that Dzungars, who did not have their own developed silkworm cultivation, could hardly use on a large scale filling from silk wool combs, which was traditionally used for making "soft" Qin armor²⁷. It is possible that the differences in the padding

²⁷ Thus, a Qing dignitary and imperial envoy to the Volga Kalmyks in 1712-1715. Tulishen (1667-1741), mentioning his official duties in China, noted that among other things he "...[checked] the manufacture of *the olbo* on silk wool" [RKO 1978: 439]. In I.K. Rossokhin's translation the Manchu phrase "... *io-ohan* and *olbo* be *weilebumme*..." translates as "... for making on silk fleece half shells...". [RKO 1978: 438, 439]. Another variant of translation: "...engaged in [production of] *olbo* on silk wool".

History

are due to an error on the part of the compiler or scribe. We should not exclude a factual error as well, when an imperial official automatically transferred to the Dzungarian *oolbog* information about the padding of the Qing's quilted armor that was familiar to him. In the second description (in *juan* 42), such an error was not repeated. Further study of Central Asian shells made of organic materials will clarify this issue.

When describing the construction of *kuyake* (*huyag*) armour the word *jing* ('mirror') is used, which is often translated as 'mirror'. However, in this case it is most likely not a mirror armor (it is described in *Siyu tuzhi* below), but a plate-stitched armor²⁸ or a ring-shaped plate armor. Both types of protective armor were very popular in the 17th - the first half of the 18th centuries among both Oirat and Muslim population of Central and Middle Asia [Bobrov and Khudyakov 2008: 378-385, 390-392; Bobrov and Ozheredov 2013: 42-63].

This version is supported by the Korean description of a 14th- and 15th-century Chinese ring and plate armour *Jingfangjia*²⁹: "An armour (chit. *jia*, kor. *kap* 甲) ... Made of steel plates (ch'i. *tieja* 鐵札, kor. *cholchhal*) and steel rings (ch'i. *tehuang* 鐵環, kor. *cholhwan*) interspersed and fastened together is called *jingfanjia* 鏡幡甲". [Sejong silok, quon 133, l. 51b].

The specified model of protective armour is a hinged
The armour's name itself contains the word "mirror" - *jing* (鏡), clearly referring to flowing plates. Note that the name of the armor itself contains the word "mirror" - *jing* (鏡), clearly referring to *tejas* plates. The latter were probably compared to polished metal mirrors by the Chinese³⁰. This allows us to note the identity of the terms *jing* ('mirror') and *teczha* ('shell plate') in this case.

In turn, the plates of *Jingfanjia* armor are similar in size to those of Central Asian *kuyaks* and kalantars. This confirms the possibility to use the term *jing* ('mirror') in relation to rectangular plates of small size and, therefore, to identify "*kuyake* ... which have plates/mirrors (*jing*)" armor mentioned in "*Xiyu tuzhi*" with plate-stitched or ring-plate armor.

²⁸ In the XVII-XVIII cc. the plate-stitched (plate-gagged) armor with inner armor was known in Europe as *brigandine* (German: *Brigantine*), and in the Turkic and Russian languages in the XVII-XVIII cc. - The *pantzir* was known in Europe as brigandine (German: *Brigantine*).

²⁹ *Jingfangjia* (Chinese 鏡幡甲, *kyongbongap* 경번갑) is literally "cloth armour with mirrors (*jing*)".

³⁰ The Korean reading of the character for "mirror" (鏡) is *kyong*, the Chinese reading is *jing*. Written in classical Chinese (Chinese *wenyan* 文言; 漢文, kor. *hanmun*, jap. *kambun*, viet. *hanwang*), the texts were international and easily read in any country where hieroglyphics were used. The Chinese origin of the *gyeongbongap* armor is evidenced by another entry from the Korean chronicle *Taejong sillok* of 1414:

"They relieved *Kunggi pujong* (deputy head of the armament production department) Choi Hesun, *pangwan* (judge) Yong Hwe, *chikjang* Sun Gundal and scribe Yoon Geun because they first ordered [Choi] Hesun to supervise the production of Chinese (sic!) *gyeongbongap* armour to then distribute samples to all provinces, but [Choi] Hesun did not personally supervise [it]." See. See [Taejon sillok, quon 28, fol. 37b]. However, the term *jingfangjia* does not appear in the currently known medieval Chinese texts.

Regarding *chalaina* armor in "Siyu tuzhi" it is reported: "Those that have plates covering the heart (*husinjing*) are called *chalaina* and are made of white iron" [CHST 1782: tsz. 42].

The classic fore-Asian zircon armour of the *char-aina* usually consists of four large plates of rectangular, subrectangular or trapezoidal shape. From Central Asia comes the *char-aina*, which is made of thin, light iron that an outsider might mistake for tin-plated metal. Unlike its Near Eastern prototype, the elements that make up this armor are not made in one piece, but riveted and fitted with additional stiffening ribs. Their appearance reminds them of significantly increased in size plates of *kuyak* or a ring-shaped *kalantar* of the Central Asian type [Akhmetjan 2007: 144 (fig. 124, 1, 4)].

One more variety of Central Asian *char-aina* was an armour of four roundish plates connected with leather straps [Bobrov & Khudyakov 2008: 479, 480, 499 (fig. 209, 1, 3-6)]³¹.

The above information allows us to conclude that by the term "chala ina" the Qing authors probably mean a four-part armour made of rectangular or rounded *zerzal* plates.

The word *baledamutsi* (Turkic *beldemči*, *beldemči* [Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018: 70]) in the text "Siyu tuchzhi" refers to an "iron belt" that was worn over the main shell [Bakaeva 2017: 59; Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018: 70].

Beldemchi is derived from the common Turkic *bel* 'waist, loin' [Baeva 2017: 59; Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018: 70]. [Bakaeva 2017: 59; Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018: 70]³². In the costume of the Turkic peoples it is usually the "waistwear" of married Kyrgyz, Kazakh and Karakalpak women [Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018: 70]. However, the same term could also be used for "belt with armour protection", which covered "the waist and part of the thighs" of the warrior. A similar interpretation is recorded, for example, in the Kyrgyz epos [Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018: 70]³³.

The context of the report in *Siyu tuchzhi* also suggests that this is not an ordinary dialed belt but a special element of protective armament. Comparison of Qing's description and Kyrgyz epos with the material and pictorial sources allows supposing that *baledamutsi* (*beldemchi*) implies an armored belt-corset made of iron plates of rectangular and subrectangular shape. The latter were riveted on three leather straps, slightly overlapping each other. When assembled, the belt was a wide plate corset that covered the warrior's abdomen and lower back. The samples of such armor belts and their fragments come from Tibet, Eastern Turkestan, Kazakhstan, Western Mongolia and South Siberia [Bobrov and Ogeredov 2021: 172]³⁴.

³¹ It is noteworthy that the Qing zernacle *Huxinqing*, with which the authors "The *Siyu tuzhi* is compared to the *chalain*, also in the form of a faintly convex circular disc.

³² Cf. the name of the cloth sashka - *belbeu* [Zakharova and Khojaeva 1964: 59].

³³ In the Kyrgyz language, the term combat belt was also used to refer to *beldik* [Beibutova 1986: 19].

³⁴ According to the data of K. S. Akhmetzhan, a similar plated belt-cord-set was called *zhauyngerlik beldik* among Kazakhs [Akhmetzhan 2005: 86].

History

The attribution of *baledamutsi* (*beldemchi*) as a plate belt-corset is indirectly confirmed, among other things, by the way of wearing it (over the main body armor) and its mentioning right after the description of *char-aina* armor made of rounded or rectangular plates. According to the ethnographical materials, usually "armour sashes" were worn over the chain armour and were often worn together with *char-aina* armour of rounded plates [LaRocca 2006: 7, 13, 132-136; Bobrov and Khudjakov 2008: 342, 481-484; Bobrov, Ogeredov 2021: 172-177].

"Duyulega (都裕勒噶青也) is a helmet. The inside has a hat (Ch. mao 帽, [which] covering [the head] in the front, reaches the forehead, spreading out in the back, reaches the neck, swishing left and right reaches both ears. It is called *tu-bo-bei-er-ku* (圖卜貝爾庫). [CCCT 1782: tsz. 42].

The compilers of *Siyu tuzhi* gave the Mongolian word *duyilega* "helmet" (Mong. *duulga*, Kalm. *duulh*; Turk. *dulyga*, *tuulga*, *tuulga*) [BAMRS, 1 2001: 79; KIRS 1977: 217], but it is written otherwise than in the section about the armament of the Oirat. It can be assumed that in this case it was a clerical error and that the text carver should have put the graphically similar a character with a *gu* sound (e.g. 峪). Otherwise the word may have been borrowed from a dialect of a Mongolian language, where the intervocal γ has already fallen out - *duulga*³⁵.

If in the description of Oirat helmets the Qin authors recorded some features of their design, in the case of the "Muslim" headgear only the fact of its existence is noted. On the other hand, a helmet-shelmet called "tu-bo-bei-er-ku" (圖卜貝爾庫) is discussed in detail. The word combination *töbe bōrik* (lit. 'top hat') may be given in a similar way³⁶. However, *bōrik* headdresses popular among Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Kyrgyz and Uigurs usually do not have earpieces and the back piece mentioned in the Qing source [Zakharova and Khojaeva 1964: 67, 68, 70-72].

It is possible that in this case we are talking about a poly-functional headdress, which could play the role of an under-helmet, while its earpieces and back piece covered the ears and neck of the warrior like a soft quilted barrette³⁷. Such a quilted bashlyk-shaped headdress on a lining similar to the Kazakh *dalbai*, *zhalbagai* or *kuləpar* equipped with wide earpieces and back piece could serve as such a hat [Zakharova and Khodjaeva 1964: 66, 71, 72]. This, inter alia, explains the name of sub-cap - "top hat" (*öbe bōrik*), as in peace time bashlyk could be worn over the main headwear. In summer they are over-

³⁵ It is also possible that Qin authors tried to reproduce the sounding of the term from a Turkic informant, because by the middle of the 18th century the Mongolian word *duulga* had long since entered the languages of many Turkic peoples of Central Asia.

³⁶ The authors of this article are grateful to Dr. A.K. Kushkum-bayev for his assistance in reconstructing the term in question.

³⁷ As shown in the visual materials, such hats could also be worn as headwear during campaigns, in military camps, between battles, etc.

They protected the wearer from dust, sun and rain, while in winter they protected from snow and wind. At the same time, winter cloaks could be lined with wool [Zakharova and Khodjaeva 1964: 72].

It is also worth noting that in the Mongolian-Russian-French Dictionary by O. M. Kolevski, published in 1849, the word *tobi is* translated from Mongolian as "a felted cap worn under the helmet" [Mazarchuk 2017: 96]. [Mazarchuk 2017: 96]. In turn, F. Lessing offers different translations for *tobi* and *tobi malayai* - "a felted cap worn under the helmet" and "a headdress with four turned up lapels" respectively [Mazarchuk 2017: 96]. In this regard, it is possible that *tobe borik* may be a Turkic variant of Mongolian *tobi malayai* in the meaning "hat with a helmet".

Material, written and pictorial sources indicate that in the late Middle Ages and modern times the eastern peoples were actively experimenting with various variants of headdresses capable of protecting the wearer's head from the blows of enemy weapons, if necessary. They ranged from *malakai* hats with high quilted crowns to specialized "soft helmets" such as "paper hats" and their Central Asian and Indian counterparts. Despite differences in the material and cut, almost all varieties of these hats were equipped with wide and long earpieces and backpieces [Bobrov and Khudyakov 2008: 472, 473; Bobrov 2012: 213-220].

"Shalabaer (沙拉布爾) *is the name for leather trousers. When getting ready for battle, a shell is worn on the outside and leather trousers (piku 皮褲) on the inside. The halves of the garment are tucked into them. [This] makes it possible to turn the body easily, deftly and with power*³⁸ " [CCCT 1782: tsz. 42].

The word *shalabare* refers to the upper trousers of the Turkic nomads of Central and Central Asia, known as *shalbars*, *chalbars*, *chembars* and *trousers*.

Shalbars were wide and long trousers made of leather, paper or woolen cloth. A distinction was made between summer and winter *shalbars*. The latter could be made of sheepskin fur inside (kaz. *tepi shalbar*) or quilted with cotton or wool. Usually *shalbars* were worn on top of *trousers-dambal*. In the XVIII - early XIX centuries *shalbars* made of suede and skins were very popular. Moreover, suede *shalbars* of nobles could be decorated with floral ornaments, braids, fur trim and others. In the middle of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries *shalbars* were most characteristic of Kazakh costume but were also used by representatives of other nations in the region [Zakharova and Khodzhaeva 1964: 39-42].

One of the peculiarities of wearing *turbans* was the tradition of tucking dressing gown flaps into them, which was quite rightly noted by the authors of the *Siyu tuzhi*. In Qing paintings from the second half of the 18th century (that is, made during the same period as the text of *Siyu tuzhi*) *shalbars* are worn predominantly by Turkic warriors. *Shalbars* are most prominently depicted on the scroll dedicated to the feat of the Manchu military leader Machan. They are worn by a Turkic armored man who was hit by the Qin warlord's arrow (fig. 1). Wide light brown (leather?) trousers are tightened above the loin. Lower edge of trousers

³⁸ Meaning. "there is strength in dexterity".



Figure 1. Muslim warrior in chainmail and *shalbars*. Fragment of Qin scroll "Ma- chan breaks through [the enemy's] lines". Art. Lan Shinin (G. Castiglione), between 1760 and 1766. Gugong Museum, Taipei, Taiwan. Taiwan

[*Fig. 1.* Muslim warrior wearing chain mail and *shalbar*. Subpicture of the Qing scroll titled 'Machan Battles through the (Enemy's) Line'. Pic. By Lang Shining (G. Castiglione), 1760 to 1766. National Palace Museum, Taipei (Taiwan)]

passes around the ankle. Interestingly, the *shalbars* in this drawing are not only tucked into the hem of the dressing gown, but probably also the hem of the chainmail³⁹. The monumental painting "The Great Victory of Kurman" by the court painter Lan Shinin (然沁, real name Giuseppe Castiglione, 1688-1766) shows that the trousers of the *turbans* could be worn not only over the shoes, but also tucked into boots with a wide cuff.

While the fact that nomads wore *shalbars* was repeatedly noted by contemporaries, the reasons for using this type of trousers in combat conditions are rather rare in written sources. The more important is the relevant passage in the *Siyu tuzhi*: "[Putting half a dressing gown into a *shalbara*] enables one to turn his body easily, dexterously, and with power". [CHST 1782: tsz. 42]. Being tucked into *shalbars*, the dressing gown's flaps were not entangled in the legs, which had a positive effect on the mobility of a warrior, especially in a hurried position⁴⁰.

³⁹ The use of a *turban* and a ringed armour in this painting illustrates the authors of *Siyu tuzhi*'s thesis that "when they prepare for battle, they put the armour on the outside and leather trousers on the inside".

⁴⁰ Another way of achieving a similar result was by tucking the hem of the dressing gown around the waist, which was widely practiced by the Oirat, as well as their Muslim vassals and neighbours, according to Qing pictorial material.

Interestingly, *shalbars* are the only garment that is mentioned in "Siyu tuzhi" in the section devoted to the armament of "Muslims" in Central and Central Asia. The Qing authors' treatment of *halbars* as a part of "military costume" probably results from their active use in the course of military operations (including their use in combination with metal body armor). The use of *shalbars* by nomads in marching, hunting and fighting is also confirmed by other written and pictorial sources of the XVIII-XIX centuries.

"I AM (雅). Onion (Chinese gong 弓). They are made of kudraniya triostrene (kits. zhemu 柘木) base, the horse mane is used to make a bowstring. The power [of these bows] is very great." [KHST 1782: tsz. 42].

The term quoted by the Qing authors is one of the traditional Turkic names for onions - *yay*, *yaya*, *yaa* (*yay*), *zhay* (*zha*).

According to the *Siyu tuzhi*, onions were made from the wood of *Cudrania tricuspidata* (lat. *Cudrania tricuspidata*), which grows in present-day China, Afghanistan, Iran and other countries. The plant is a relatively short (up to 6 m) two-leafed tree of the mulberry family.

Unfortunately, *kibiti* wood from the majority of known Central Asian bows of Late Middle Ages and Modern times has not become the object of special scientific research, which makes it difficult to assess the authenticity of the information reported by the Qing source. However, given the fact that kudraniya wood is characterized by high strength, lightness and beautiful texture, the possibility of its use for making *kibiti* bows seems very probable⁴¹.

Further study of bows in Central Asia and Central Asia will also clarify the information in *Siyu tuzhi* regarding the extent to which horse mane webbing is woven in the region.

Archery was one of the most important elements of Qing warriors' training in the first half to the middle of the 18th century. The latter used very powerful compound bows that allowed them to send arrows at a distance of several hundred meters [Bobrov 2021: 80]. In this context the authors of *Siyu tuzhi* assess the *Yay* bow as "very strong" [TsKhST 1782: tsz. [CCST 1782: tsz. 42]. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the authors of "Siyu tuzhi" assessed the bow as "very strong" [TSHST 1782: tsz.42].

We should also note that when describing the armament of Dzungaria and its adjacent territories the authors of "Siyu tuzhi" mention bows of local warriors twice, first under the Mongolian name *num*, and then - under the Turkic *Yay*. It is possible that this approach was caused not only by the desire to indicate different names of identical bows among the peoples of the region, but also by some peculiarities of their construction and design system. Analysis of authentic samples of bows of the Mongolian and Turkic-speaking population of Central and Middle Asia

⁴¹ It should be noted that in Qing China itself, wood from the *tutu* family was also used for making some elements of *kibiti* bows [Bobrov 2021: 77].

History

The traditional Mongolian *num* bows were indeed somewhat different in size, construction and design from the *kaman* or *yay* bows made by the masters of the Muslim East [Khorasani 2006: 727-735; The Arts... 2008: 385; Bobrov, Khudyakov 2008: 81-92; Anisimova 2013: 187, 189-191; Alexander 2015: 298-300].

"*Oke* / *aoko* / *eke* (鄂克). Arrows (*qian* 箭). The wood is used to make the shaft (*gan* 桿). The tips are made from the finest steel (*bingite* 鑛鐵). The spearheads have 3 facets (*chin sanyanzhen* 三面刃), and there are also double-edged spearheads (*chin liangmyanzhen* 兩面刃). Those shafts that have plumage (*chit. gan yu yu zhe* 桿有羽者) are used for shooting at long range, and those that have pile (*chit. mao* 毛) are used for short-range [range]." [CHST 1782: tsz. 42].

The Qing authors transcribed the Turkic word for arrow, *oke*, accurately enough.

The "best steel" (*bint* 鑛鐵) probably refers to some kind of "patterned steel" - cast bulat or welded damascus. In the treatise

"The Ge gu yao lun (格古要論) of the second half of the 14th century, compiled by Cao Zhao, said that "the best steel (*bintye*) comes from the Western Lands (*Xi-fan*). [If the iron] on its surface has spiral patterns [or] pattern in the form of sesame seeds, [then] usually [when] polishing weapons [like] swords / daggers and sabers / swords / knives (*daotszyan*), [that they become] shiny, use yellow sulfate. If their pattern becomes visible, their price far surpasses silver. In the olden days it was said that when distinguishing iron by quality, one distinguishes [iron] with a "golden" [pattern, and] that with a black pattern is counterfeit. One should carefully examine and verify. Among the blade weapons (*Taozi*) three [things] are unsurpassed: "Water [blades] of the *Tao* commanders of the Great Jin (1115-1234). Handles of Western Lands made of [wood] *silaimu*. Tatar sheaths made of birch bark. One pair of *birchbark* scabbards was once made with unsurpassed skill. On the outside there were gilded patterns. On the reverse were inlaid with silver Muslim writings. We order iron from the northern provinces of Gansu, [which] is of a bluish-black colour. It is of the strongest quality. In the arid North, it is often used to make sharp sabers / swords / knives (*dao*). [But] their price is much less than the price of *bintye*⁴². The term *binte* itself may be translated with some assumption as "imported steel", because originally the hieroglyph *binte* (賓) was written without the key "metal" (金) and indicated a guest, a visitor, a customer. The Chinese interpretation of this character according to the "Kangxi zidian" is very general: "[From] iron *bin* (*binte*) make very sharp knives / swords / sabers (*dao*)"⁴³. Modern dictionaries give a more general reference to "high grade steel". Sometimes it is noted that it is either the result of forging a package of twisted strips of steel with different carbon content (damascus) or it is cast (bulat). However, the only authentic description of *the binti* can be considered a treatise by Cao Zhao cited above, because this author lived in the late Yuan period (1279-1368) - early Ming period (1368-1644). It was during the Yuan period that the

⁴² See: [Cao Zhao].

⁴³ See: [Kangxi Zidian].

The Department of Works (Gongbu 工部) had a "Binte Steel Department" (Binte Jiu 鑛鐵局). This prompts to take with confidence both the attribution of *the Bingite* made by Cao Zhao and the information that the *Bingite* steel came from the "Western lands", i.e. probably from Iran, Kashmir or India [CHGDC 2002: 21].

Thus, the word *bintite* in Siyu tuzhi may refer to cast boulat, welded damascus or simply very high quality steel. However, material sources do not yet confirm the widespread distribution of bulat arrowheads in the region under study. It is possible that the Qian authors, when comparing arrowheads with bulat or damascus steel, on the one hand demonstrated their knowledge and education, and on the other hand, emphasized the high quality of these products.

It is not quite clear, what the authors of "Siyu tuzhi" mean by tips that have "three sides": armor-piercing tips with narrow three-sided feather, or their three-blade counterparts. Both types are represented in the shooting tools of the populations of the Muslim East, Central Asia and adjoining territories of late Middle Age and early New Age [Khorasani 2006: 745-747; Akhmetjan 2007: 94; Darja 2013: 67, 68].

The three-lobed spearheads are more characteristic of the early and late Middle Ages, but they continued to be used sporadically in certain regions of Eurasia until ethnographic times.

The "double-edged" tip probably refers to arrows with a broader flattened feather of elongated-triangular, elongated-rhombic and pentagonal shape. The side edges of the tip of such an arrowhead were carefully sharpened into razor-sharp blades. These arrows were intended mainly to hit an unarmed enemy. They are widely represented both among Iranian and Indian, as well as among Central Asian and Kazakh materials [Khorasani 2006: 727, 737, 746, 747; Akhmetjan 2007: 94, 97].

Wooden arrowheads could be fitted with two main types of operations. It is known from ethnography that arrows designed for long-range shooting often had a shorter, stiffer and narrower tip, while their counterparts for short-range shooting, on the contrary, had a longer and wider tip [Darja 2013: 58, 59, 61, 62, 63].

The Siyu tuzhi text for the latter category of arrows mentions *operoni-na-mao*. Literally, *mao* is translated as 'hair' or 'hair'. However in some cases *mao* may be used in the sense of "feather"⁴⁴. It is possible that in this context *mao* refers to a broad, soft, "tufted" plumage of bird feathers of appropriate texture and size. Further study of the region's arrows may help to clarify this issue.

"Saqedake (薩克達克). It is a lockable gun case (*gaojian* 囊鍵). Made of animal skins, a rope loop or strap is used to [cover] the neck. [KHST 1782: tsz. 42].

The transcription *sakedake* conveys the Turkic origin of the term *sa- gaidak / saadak / saydak / sadak*. In a broad sense it may have been used to refer to the entire shooting complex as a whole. In its narrower sense it meant bow, naluch or quiver. In the text "Siyu tuzhi" it is mentioned in the meaning of "naluch" or "quiver".

⁴⁴ For example, *yanmao* (鴈毛) - lit. "goose hair", i.e. goose feather.

History

Known examples of quivers of Central and Central Asian nomads are made mainly of leather (however, not always it can be attributed as "skins of wild animals" or "fur"-*shawpi*). In the late Middle Ages and early modern times, arrows in such quiver-cases were placed with the tip down, plumage up. The internal space of a quiver was usually divided into separate sections by special bands, ropes or leather straps [Bobrov, Khudyakov 2008: 129-156]. On the one hand, such distributors prevented arrows from falling out of the quiver during intensive horse-racing, but on the other hand they helped to quickly find an arrow with the right type of tip (each section of the quiver could hold arrows with a certain form of quill). It is possible that it is these distributive straps that are described in Siyu tuzhi as "rope loops" and "straps" that are used to cover the "neck" of the quiver.

"Aliyamu (阿里雅木). *Small banner with a buncheon* (Chinese *xiao duqi* 小纛旗)⁴⁵. *It is more than 5 chi (more than 1.6 m) long and more than 3 chi (about 1 m) wide. White cloth is used to make the cloth. On the top, a horizontal line of Muslim letters (回字) is written in Chinese Huizu. Each bek (ch. bokeh 伯克) has a flag with his name written on top of the cloth (ch. fushan 幅上) so that each bek could be identified [by the banner]."* [TsKhST 1782: tsz. 42].

The term *aliyamu* is the Persian word *alam*, referring to a banner as well as a penny pin or pennant.⁴⁶

According to the Siyu tuzhi, *the alam had the appearance of a white cloth attached to the staff, measuring about 1.6 m by 1 m. In the upper part of the flag there were inscriptions in "horizontal lines... in Muslim letters".* [CCST 1782: tsz. 42], i.e. in Arabic script. Banners of white colour were quite popular among the Turkic rulers of Central and Middle Asia of the late Middle Ages and early modern times. On the one hand, it corresponded to Muslim traditions⁴⁷ and, on the other hand, correlated well with the white banners and banners of Genghis Khan and Genghisids.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, white banners were mentioned among the military symbols of the Kazahks, Kokand, Eastern Turkestan and other peoples of the Muslim East.

The question remains open as to which side (wide or narrow) the cloth of the *alam* described in the Siyu tuzhi was attached to the flagstaff⁴⁸. For the Ottoman Empire

⁴⁵ This is a literal translation. However, it is possible that this speech should be understood allegorically. For example, in the dictionary Liubu chengyu zhujie. Binbu" ("Interpretation of words used in the Six Ministries. The Military Manual") notes that "...the great banner of the commander-in-chief (*yuan shuai* 元帥) is called *duqi*" [Liubu chengyu... 1987: 113]. Accordingly, the phrase "Xiao duqi" in the text "Xiyu tuzhi" may be translated as "The Little Banner of the Commander".

⁴⁶ The population of East Turkestan was not an exception in this respect. The population of Eastern Turkestan was no exception in this respect.

⁴⁷ One of the earliest Muslim flags, the *Liwa'i*, had a white cloth covered with black lettering. A similar flag was handed to the commander of the army.

⁴⁸ In the text, the *alam* cloth is denoted by the term *fu* (幅), which literally means "strip of cloth. This designation indicates the elongated rectangular shape of the flag, which was not generally characteristic of Qing China in the period in question. Most Qing flags were triangular, square or oblong.

The horizontal arrangement of the flag (also typical of European flags) was more common in Syria and Iran. In this way the narrow side of a rectangular flag was nailed or tied to the flagstaff. However, for the Mongolian-speaking nomads of Central Asia, on the contrary, the vertical placement of the flag was typical. In relation to *the alam* of Siyu Tuzhi, the second variant seems preferable. Anyway, in the Qing picture depicting the battle of Kurman (February 3-8, 1759) the narrow cloths of small banners (including white ones), carried by mounted soldiers behind their backs, are vertical. If our assumption is correct, then the 'length' of the flag in Siyu tuzhi should be understood as its height.

Of considerable interest is the mention by Qing authors that each bek had a small banner, with the top part of the flag being "... his name is written, so that each bek could be identified [by the banner]". [TsKhST 1782: tsz. 42]. Judging by the mentioning of the title "bek", this primarily refers to the *banners-alamas* of the rulers of the Muslim population of East Turkestan, who carried such a title.

"Touke (圖克). A large banner with a buncheon. Length 7-8 chi (2.2-2.6 m), width approximately the same, a cloth is made of multicoloured fabric. On the top of the cloth (?) is sewed cut out of gold foil⁴⁹ the name of the founder of the religion - the Prophet⁵⁰. Under the gold letters, ribbons are made of red horsehair, which hang down like a fringe...⁵¹" [CCST 1782: tsz. 42].

A large banner with a *tike* bunchuk (Mong. *tug* [BAMRS, 3 2001: 248, 249])⁵² is described in "Siyu tuchzhi" as a flag with a large square or rectangular cloth of multicoloured fabric. Genuine banners of Central Asian peoples were indeed often made of coloured, often ornamented cloth. In most cases the ornamentation is represented by a repeating pattern in the form of different geometric figures, stylized flowers, leaves, bouquets, plant shoots, etc. The perimeter of such banners could be decorated with fringes, ribbons, hair tassels, etc., and a buncle was tied to the upper part of the staff (under the tip).⁵³

The Qing source's text notes that "On the top of the banner is sewn the name of the founder of the religion, the Prophet, carved in gold foil". However, it is possible that this could be the gold figurative top of the banner, which is a plate with the name of Muhammad carved on it. If this hypothesis is correct, then this phrase could be interpreted as follows: "Above the cloth [at the top of the banner] is the name of the founder of the religion, the Prophet, carved in gold plate."

The shape of the cloth was either rectangular, subrectangular or rectangular, in which case the sides differed only slightly [HLT 2004: 421-532, 785-804].

⁴⁹ Another translation is: "Above the cloth is tied a gold plate carved..."

⁵⁰ Proc. "Pai-ga-mu-ba-er" (派噶木巴爾) - *Paigambar*, i.e. prophet.

⁵¹ This is followed by the poems of the Qianlong emperor of 1758 and 1760 dedicated to "very elegant Muslim banner" (*huidu* 回纆) [CCCT 1782: tsz. 42].

⁵² The Muslim population of East Turkestan actively borrowed many words for political and everyday realities from their Oirat suzerains, as evidenced by the authors of the Siyu Tuzhi.

⁵³ See, for example, the Central Asian flag from the collection of the State Hermitage Museum.

History

The tops of Muslim banners from the 17th-19th centuries are authentic and can be used to support this hypothesis. In a considerable number of cases they are shaped (sometimes gilded or made of gold) plates with a carved inscription in Arabic script in the centre [Alexander 2015: 249-253]. The images show that hair brushes (bunchuki), ribbons, feathers, etc. could be suspended under such a tip.

The description of armament and military symbolism of "Muslims" in East Turkestan and neighboring territories in *tsüan* 42 "Siyu tuzhi" ends with quotations from Chinese historical chronicles from the ancient, early and developed Middle Ages containing information about military activities of the population of the western region and its neighbours. By comparing this data with mid-eighteenth-century records, the Qing authors attempted to explain some peculiarities of the development of weapons of the peoples of the region.

"In the section "Description of the Western Region" of the "Han shu" chronicle.⁵⁴ It [says] that behind [the outpost of] Yangguan the first is [the possession of] Zhoqiang (Charklyk. - L.B., A.P.).

... There is iron in the mountains, making weapons themselves. Of the weapons, there are bows (kits. gong 弓), spears (kits. mao 矛), short dao (kits. fudao 服刀), swords (kits. jian 劍), armor (kits. jia 甲)... In Nandou (north-east areas of Pakistan and adjoining areas of Kashmir. - L.B., A.P.) have silver, copper, and gold to make weapons. All the possessions [weapons] have the same".

⁵⁴ The text of the CCCT contains a heavily truncated and partially altered quotation from tsz. 96 "Description of the Western Region, ch. 1" of the "Han shu" dynastic history (Book [of the Han dynasty]) is inserted in the text of the CCCT. The work was written by the historian Ban Gu (32-98 A.D.) and his sister Ban Zhao (ca. 45-120 A.D.), who used the work of their father Ban Biao (3-54 A.D.). The information about the Western Province is based on the reports of the brother of the authors of the dynastic history Ban Chiao (32-102 AD), who for several years was on a diplomatic and military missions in the Central Asian countries: "Going beyond [outpost] Yangguan, the first possession is Zhoqiang. The ruler of Zhoqiang, nicknamed Qiuhu, arrived with a declaration of submission [to the Han court]. The [capital of the domain] is at 1 800 *li* from Yangguan, and from Chang'an on 6 300 *li*. The ruler stays in the southwest [of the domain], and does not follow Confucius teachings. 450 households, 1,750 inhabitants, 500 selected warriors (kit. *shenbin*), contiguous with the Tsemo (Cherchen. - L. B., A.P.) possession in the west, they follow the cattle [in search of] grass, they are not engaged in farming. They depend on Shanshan (Pichang. - L.B., A.P.) property in the Tsemo [river] valley. There is iron in the mountains, they make weapons themselves. There are bows (Ch. *gong*), spears (Ch. *mao*), short [single-bladed] cleavers (Ch. *fudao*), swords (Ch. *tsyan*), armor (Ch. *tsia*). In the northwest reaches [the borders of] Shanshan, which [it] owns... The possession of Nandou. The governor's station stretches from Chang'an for 10,150 *li*, 5,000 households, the population - 31 thousand people, selected warriors - 8 thousand men, to the northeast, to the *Duhu* (a Chinese official in charge of relations with the possessions of Central Asia. - In the south - 340 *li* to Ulyuey (dominion on the Pamir mountains. - L.B., A.P.), in the southwest - 330 *li* to Tszibin (dominion in the north of Kash- world, L. B., A.P.), south from it was Zhotsyan, in the north - Xusun (held in the territory of modern Kyrgyzstan. - L. B., A.P.), in the west - Great Yuezhi (r. Kushan state. - L. B., A.P.). They grow 5 cereals (usually rice, millet, barley, wheat, and beans - L. B., A. P.), grapes, and all fruits. There is gold, silver, copper, and iron, and they make weapons equal to those of all other dominions. Subject to the Jibin." See: [Ban Gu].

In the section "Description of the Western Region" of the "Hou Han shu" chronicle.⁵⁵ It [says that] in Yanzi (Karashar. - L. B., A. P.) were able to make bows and arrows (Ch. *gongshi*).

In the section "Description of the Western Region" of the "Bei Shi" chronicle⁵⁶ [it is said that] weapons of Gaochan warriors consisted of bows and arrows (*gongjian* 弓箭), swords/sabers (*Dao* 刀), shields (*Dun* 楯), armour (*Jia* 甲) and spears (*Sho* 槊). Yanqi warriors⁵⁷ had bows (*gong* 弓), sabers/swords (*dao* 刀), armor (*jia* 甲) and spears (*sho* 槊).

According to records in the *Tang shu*⁵⁸, the Tufans (Tibetans) were able to storm cities with flying ladders (Chinese *feiti* 飛梯)⁵⁹ and goose chariots (Chinese *eche* 鷩車).

⁵⁵ A distorted quotation from tsz. 88 "Description of the Western Region" of the dimensional history "Hou Han shu" (Book of the Later Han [dynasty]) compiled in the first half of the 5th century by historian Fan Ye (398-446), who worked at the court of the Southern Chinese dynasty, Liu Song (420-479). Contrary to the data of the "Siyu tuzhi" authors, the passage about bows refers not to the kingdom of Yanzi (Karashar. - L.B., A.P.), but to Pulei (a possession supposedly located in the vicinity of Lake Barkul. - L. B., A. P.): "The possession Pul'ei is situated in the Shuyu valley west from the Heavenly Mountains (Tianshan. - L. B., A.P.). At 1,290 *li* to the southeast [from it] lies the office of a *zhanshi* (from 123 AD a Chinese official in charge of relations with the Central Asian possessions, instead of a *duo*, whose office was located in the area of the modern Liukchun city in XUAR, PRC. - The site was located in *Liukchun, Xinjiang, China*. Over 800 courtyards, population over 2,000, and a select army of over 700 men. They live in the tents, follow water and grass (i.e. are engaged in nomadic cattle breeding - L.B., A.P.), are skilled in farming to a certain extent, breed domestic animals - horses, camels and sheep. They know how to make bows and arrows. From [this] possession come good horses". See: [Fan Ye].

⁵⁶ The text includes a somewhat distorted quotation from the c. c. 97 "Description of the Western Region" of the historical chronicle *Bei shi* ("History of the Northern Dynasties") describing the events of 386-618. The text is somewhat distorted (changing the order of weapons) and citation from tsz. 97 "Description of the Western Region" of the historical chronicle *Bei shi* ("History of Northern Dynasties") describing events 386-618: "[Possession] of Ga-chang... the weapons of soldiers consist of bows (ch. *gong* 弓), swords/blades (ch. *dao* 刀), arrows (ch. *tszia* 劍), swords and sabers (ch. *tsiao* 刀). *Dao* 刀), arrows (Ch. *jian* 劍), shields (Ch. *dun* 楯), armor (Ch. *jia* 甲) and long spears (Ch. *sho* 槊) - the original *Beishi* uses a different character with the same meaning and sound - L. B, A.P.) ... The possession of Yanqi ... warriors have bows (Ch. *gong* 弓), swords/sabers (Ch. *dao* 刀), armor (Ch. *jia* 甲) and long spears (Ch. *sho* 槊)". It should be taken into account that this chronicle was compiled already in the period of Tang dynasty (618-907), i.e. much later than the described events. See: [Bei shi].

⁵⁷ Yanqi is an ancient possession in the Western Region. Nowadays, it is a village of Karashar located in Yanqi-Hui Autonomous Region of Bayan-Gol-Mongol Autonomous Region of Xinjiang UAR, PRC.

⁵⁸ This refers to one of the two historical chronicles of the Tang dynasty (618-907), the *Ju Tang shu* (Old Tang dynasty chronicle) and the *Xin Tang shu* (New history of the Tang dynasty). "*Jiu Tangshu* was compiled in the first half of the 10th century by Liu Xiu (888-947), who served in the courts of the Later Tang (923-937) and Later Jin (936-947) dynasties. "*Xing Tangshu* was written in 1060 by the famous Chinese scholars and literati Ouyang Xu (1007-1072) and Song Qi (998-1061). Since this is not a citation but a paraphrase of identical information from *the juan*, "Description of Tufan (Tibet) Part 2," it is hard to tell which chronicle was used by the *Xiyu tuzhi*.

⁵⁹ The traditional Chinese name for an assault ladder.

History

*The Wenxian Tunkao*⁶⁰ says that in Tianzhu (India. - L.B., A.P.) there are also ways of using flying ladders and underground passages (Kit. *didao* 地道⁶¹, wooden oxen and self-propelled horses (Kit. *munyu luma* 木牛流馬)⁶².

Modern Muslims do not have weapons of this kind. This is because Tibet and India are south of the Muslims. Therefore the manufacture of their [weapons] is different from that of the 36 possessions [of the Western Province]. And what is more, the Muslims of today have subdued the Dzungars and can now [make] only the usual slashing and cutting [weapons], and this presents a difficulty in presenting the information on this subject. Is it not because the Qi of the south is weak and malleable, and the [qi] of the north is strong and tough? [CCST 1782: tsz. 42].

Conclusions

The analysis of tszuan42 "Siyu tuzhi" shows that it systematized information on weaponry and military symbols of Muslims in Eastern Turkestan and possibly some neighboring territories known to Qin officials of the second half of the 18th century. It can be assumed that most of this information was received by the members of the research expedition to Dzungaria and Eastern Turkestan in 1756-1759. The main informants were probably representatives of the local Oirat and Turkic population, as well as Qin servicemen who participated in the incorporation of these regions into the empire. Later, this information could have been supplemented and edited by members of the imperial commission, which included Manchu military commanders who had participated in military operations in Central Asia.

Three types of bladed weapons (*kylych*, *se-lam*, *khanjar*), spear (*nayza*), axe (*aibalta*), bow (*yay*), arrows (*ok*) and quiver (*saadak*) are described in Juan 42, chain mail (*sauyt*), plated armour (*kuyak*), quilted soft armour (*olbog*), mirror armour (*char-ayna*), helmet (*duulga*), plated belt (*beldemchi*). Of the military costume elements, the under-helmet and upper trousers - *shalbars* were paid special attention to. Two varieties of battle flags are described in detail: the *alam*, small bek's flags, and the *tug*, or "big banner". The description of each item is accompanied by a transcription of its original name. In some cases the material of manufacture and the main typical dimensions are given.

It is noteworthy that the Qing authors had a good command of the Turkic and Mongolian languages, successfully transcribing the names of various kinds and types of weapons and armor with the help of hieroglyphics. This allowed most of the items mentioned in the source to be confidently identified.

⁶⁰ The text uses a distorted quotation from tsz. 338 of the encyclopaedia *Wenxian tunkao* ('Comprehensive study of historical works'), compiled in 1317. Ma Duanlin (1245-1322): "Tianzhu (India. -L. B, A. P.) <...> the practice is to walk barefoot, to costume in white, to avoid battle, to carry bows and arrows (*gongjian*), armor (*jia*), and long spears (*sho*), and to employ ladders (*feiti*), backhoes (*didao*), wooden oxen and self-propelling horses (*munyu luma*). See: [Ma Duanlin].

⁶¹ This refers to the undermining of fortresses when storming fortresses.

⁶² It refers to the wooden oxen and horses invented, according to legend, by the Chinese general Zhuge Liang (181-234) to transport provisions.

Comparison of "Siyu tuzhi" data with original weaponry of Central Asian Turkic population and its images showed that Qing authors were quite accurate in their description of design and decoration of close combat weaponry and armor for the population of the study area. This also gives credibility to those items and weapons mentioned in the text that are not yet confirmed by material sources. Such items include, for example, scabbards of *kylych* sabers trimmed with fish skin, ivory and tortoise shell. Another example of this kind is the description of a half axe, which consists of an asymmetrical blade, an iron hilt topped with a spear-shaped tip and a spiked or serrated striker.

The information given in "Siyu tuzhi" about original names, sizes and decoration of banners, staff and blade weapons, rifle sets and helmets is of great scientific value, as in other written sources of the XVII-XVIII centuries the relevant information is given briefly or not available at all.

Characterizing *tszūan* 42 on the whole, one should note a rather high estimate which the Qing authors gave to the armament of their Muslim opponents. For example, "very strong" bows and "the best steel" of arrowheads are emphasized [TSXT 1782: *tsz.* 42]. The half-axe *aybalta* is named "in every respect an excellent thing which can be used in many ways". [CCST 1782: *tsz.* 42].

The tradition of Muslim peoples to tuck the floors of their gowns into wide *shalbars* is also positively assessed, as it "... enables them to turn their bodies with ease, dexterity and strength". [TSPC 1782: *tsz.* 42], etc.

Such an assessment correlates well with other written sources, which indicate that Qin officers willingly used in military operations trophy weapons captured in Dzungaria and Eastern Turkestan. Ringed armor was especially popular [Bobrov and Pastukhov 2021: 515].

It is noteworthy that the compilers of *Siyu tuchzhi*, aiming to show the breadth of their historical knowledge, tried to put the combat practice of the Muslim population of East Turkestan in the general context of the development of Central and South Asian martial art. *The juan* 42 dedicated to "Muslim tribes" concludes with historical inserts on the weaponry and military symbols of the East Turkestan, Tibetan, and Indian populations of the ancient and early medieval periods. However, if in the case of the Oirat (in *tsūan* 41) the continuity of the traditions of early nomads in their military art is noted, then comparing the weaponry of "Muslims" with the military practices of Central and South Asia, on the contrary, the differences in the ancient and contemporary (for Qing authors) military-cultural traditions are stressed. In particular, it highlights the fact that there is a lack of "Muslims" of the mid-18th century with siege techniques. The break with tradition was due, among other things, to the subjugation of the Turkic population of the region to the power of the Dzhungars.

While emphasizing the high scientific value of the *Siyu tuzhi* as a source on weapons and military symbols of the Central Asian population, at the same time it is necessary to note a number of important nuances associated with the specificity of the information given in the source.

History

The work under consideration lists many items of protective and offensive armament of the Muslim population of Central Asia. However, this list cannot be considered exhaustive. For example, there is no mention of percussive weapons (maces, sticks, etc.), standard battle axes and axes, knives, firearms, miyurki and chain "bashlykki", armlets, chain "trousers" and loincloths, etc. From material, pictorial and written sources (including Qin sources) it is known that the listed weapons were used by peoples of the study region, however information about them in *Jiuang* 42 is absent⁶³. It is also worth noting that Qing authors paid attention first of all to weaponry of a design and system, unusual for the Far East. They include the *kylych* saber with a strongly curved blade, the *aiपालेतु* half-cutting axe with an iron hilt and a lance-like tip, the *saliema* heavy cleaver-shaped bladed weapon with a long handle, etc.

Even when more common and common for Central Asian warriors weapons (spears, bows, arrows) were included in the list, the authors of *Siyu tuchzhi* tried to emphasize their nonstandard East Asian design elements: leather sheathing and copper rings on spear shafts, "iron" handles of long-lance weapons, original decoration of banners, etc.

Furthermore, the division of armament of the peoples of the region into "Dzungarian" (*tszü-an* 41) and "Muslim" (*tszüan* 42) is rather provisional and reflects the reality of the second half of the 1750s. Until that time the Turkic population of Eastern Turkestan was a regular supplier for the army of the Dzungarian state. Therefore some items of arms, classified by Qin authors as "Muslim", could be used by ethnic Oirat (for example, plated armor, sabers and swords of *Selim*, etc.). Conversely, firearms made by Dzungar *otok buuchin* masters were supplied to the detachments manned by warriors from Eastern Turkestan.

The text of *Siyu tuzhi* sometimes contains blatant errors. For instance, it is reported that sabres *kelintsi* (*kylych*) are made of "pure copper", which does not correspond to the reality. It can be assumed that such inaccuracies are not due to the bad faith of the informants, but to the mistakes of scribes who prepared the text for the xylograph carvers, who could have inserted similar graphically but different in meaning hieroglyphs in the text of the work.

However, these problematic issues do not affect the overall high estimate of "*Siyu tuchzhi*" as the main and most valuable Qin written source on weapons and banners of the Muslim population of Eastern Turkestan and neighboring territories in the first half to the middle of the 18th century. Many information recorded in "*Siyu tuchzhi*" is absent in other works, which makes it unique and makes this work of particular scientific value.

⁶³ Some of these items (for example, cannons, large-caliber and simple rifles) are mentioned in the armament of Oirat people of Dzungaria in *tsz.* 41 "*Siyu tuzhi*". [Bobrov, Pastukhov 2021: 519].

To conclude, note the significance of *Siyu tuchzhi* for deciphering the original Turkic and Mongol terms used for various weapons and armor. However, until recently attribution of armament terms that appear in folklore (including epic) works and written sources was based on the later ethnographic interpretations of the 19th - the first half of the 20th c. However, during that period many items of traditional Central Asian armament either left wide military usage, or, due to different reasons, changed their names. As a result, new or updated meanings of terms were introduced into historical dictionaries alongside the original ones. Because *Siyu Tujji* correlates names of different kinds and types of weapons and armor with peculiarities of their construction, it is possible to clarify the initial meaning of different armament terms used by Turkic peoples in the region in the first half and middle of the 18th century. This opens broad prospects for a more detailed and comprehensive study of the written and folklore heritage of Central Asia in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Age.

Abbreviations

b/g - no year of publication b/m - no

place of publication

RKO - Russian-Chinese relations

PRC XUAR - Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China

HLT - Huangchao liqi tushi tsz.

- *juan*

CCCT - Qingding Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi CCCT -

Zhongguo gudai qiu da qidian.

Sources

- BAMRS - The Big Academic Mongolian-Russian Dictionary in 4 vols. T. 1-4. T. 1. M.: Academia, 2001. 520 c. T. 2. Moscow: Academia, 2001. 536 c. T. 3. Moscow: Academia, 2001. 440 c. T. 4. Moscow: Academia, 2001. 532 c.
- Ban Gu - *Ban Gu*. Han shu (= Book [of the Han dynasty]). Tsz. 96. b/g. b/m. [electronic resource] // URL: zh.wikisource.org/wiki/漢書/卷096上 (accessed 12.06.2021). (In Chinese).
- Bei shi - Bei shi (= History of the Northern Dynasties). Tsz. 97. b/g. b/m. [electronic resource]. // URL: zh.wikisource.org/wiki/北史/卷097 (accessed 21.05.2021). (In Chinese.) DTS -
- Ancient Turkic Dictionary, Leningrad: Nauka, LO, 1969. 715 c.
- Dybo 2015 - *Dybo A. V.* Names of weapons: from Praaltai to Mongolian // Russian-Mongolian Linguistic Collection. Moscow: Chancellor, 2015. C. 209-254.
- Kangxi Zidian - Kangxi Zidian (= Kangxi Hieroglyphic Dictionary [period]). b/g. b/m. [electronic resource] // Chinese Text Project. URL: <https://ctext.org/kangxi-zidian> (accessed 11.03.2021). (In Chinese).
- CLRS 1977 - Kalmyk-Russian Dictionary. Moscow: Russian language, 1977. 764 c.
- Ma Duanlin - *Ma Duanlin*. Wenxian tunkao (= Comprehensive study of historical works). b/g. b/m. [electronic resource] // Chinese Text Project (wiki). tsz. 338. URL: <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=840191> (accessed 12.06.2021). (In Chinese).
- Sejon sillok - Sejon sillok (= Chronicle of the reign of King Sejon). *Kwon* 133
- "O re" (= The Five Rituals). Kulle sore (= Introductory remarks). Pyongi (= Weapons).

History

- Kapchu (= Armour and Helmets) [electronic resource] // URL: http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/wda_20008001_005 (accessed 19.03.2021). (In kor.)
- SRYa 1981 - Dictionary of the Russian Language, XI-XVII cc. Vyp. 8 (Krada - Lyashchina). Moscow: Nauka, 1981. 351 c.
- TRS - Turkish-Russian Dictionary. Moscow: Russian language, 1977. 966 c.
- Taejon sillok - Taejon sillok (= Chronicle of the [reign] of Taejon). 1431. b/m. [electronic resource] // URL: <http://sillok.history.go.kr/search/inspectionMonthList.do?id=kca> (accessed 11.03.2021). (In Chinese).
- Fan Ye - *Fan Ye*. Hou Han shu (= Book of the Late [Han Dynasty]). T. 88. b/g. b/m. [electronic resource] // URL: zh.wikisource.org/wiki/後漢書/卷88#蒲類國 (accessed 12.06.2021). (In Chinese).
- HLT 2004 - 皇朝禮器圖式 Huangchao liqi tushi (= Patterns of ritual utensils of the reigning dynasty). Yangzhou: Guanglin shushe, 2004. 812 c. (In Chinese).
- Cao Zhao - Cao Zhao / Ge gu yao lun (格古要論) (= On the most important when studying the past). b/m. b/g. [electronic resource] // China Text Project (wiki). URL: <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=424221> (accessed on 01.03.2021). (In Chinese).
- CCST 1782 - Qingding Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi (= The Highest Approved Geographical Description of the Western Region with Maps). 1782. b/m. [electronic resource] // Chinese text project (wiki). URL: <https://ctext.org/library.pl?if=gb&res=5025>; Electronic Chinese text project. URL: <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=545503> (accessed 11.03.2021). (In Chinese).
- Egerton 2007 - *Earl Egerton*. Indian and Oriental Arms. From the Mauryan Power to the Mughal Empire. Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2007. 294 c.

Sources

- Ban Gu. Book of Han. On: Wikisource (online digital library). Available at: zh.wikisource.org/wiki/漢書/卷096上 (accessed: June 12, 2021). (In Chin.)
- Baskakov A. N. et al. (eds.) Turkish-Russian Dictionary. Moscow: Russkiy Yazyk, 1977. 966 p. (In Turk. and Russ.).
- Cao Zhao. The Essential Criteria of Antiquities. On: Chinese Text Project (Wiki). Available at: <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=424221> (accessed: March 1, 2021). (In Chin.)
- Dybo A. V. Names of weapons: from Proto-Altaiic to Mongolian ones. In: Russian-Mongolian Linguistic Collection. Moscow: Kantsler, 2015. Pp. 209-254. (In Russ.).
- Egerton E. Indian and Oriental Arms and Armour. Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2007. 294 p. (In Russ.).
- Fan Ye. Book of the Later Han. On: Wikisource (online digital library). Available at: zh.wikisource.org/wiki/後漢書/卷88#蒲類國 (accessed June 12, 2021). (In Chin.)
- Filin F. P. (ed.) A Dictionary of the Russian Language, 11th -17th Centuries AD. Vol. 8: Kra-da - Lyashchina. Moscow: Nauka, 1981. 351 p. (In Russ.).
- History of the Northern Dynasties. On: Wikisource (online digital library). Available at: zh.wikisource.org/wiki/北史/卷097 (accessed: May 21, 2021). (In Chin.)
- Imperially Approved Illustrated Descriptions of Western Regions. 1782. On: Chinese Text Project (Wiki). Available at: <https://ctext.org/library.pl?if=gb&res=5025>; <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=545503> (accessed: March 11, 2021). (In Chin.)
- Kangxi Dictionary. On: Chinese Text Project (Wiki). Available at: <https://ctext.org/kangxi-zidian> (accessed: March 11, 2021). (In Chin.).
- Ma Duanlin. Comprehensive Study of (Historical) Writings. On: Chinese Text Project (Wiki). Available at: <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=840191> (accessed: June 12, 2021). (In Chin.).
- Munie B. D. (ed.) Kalmyk-Russian Dictionary. Moscow: Russkiy Yazyk, 1977. 764 p. (In Kalm. and Russ.).
- Nadelyaev V. M. et al. (eds.) Dictionary of Old Turkic. Leningrad: Nauka, 1969. 715 p. (In Turk.).

- Pyurbeev G. Ts. (ed.) Unabridged Academic Mongolian-Russian Dictionary. In 4 vols. Moscow: Academia, 2001. Vol. 1, 520 p.; vol. 2, 536 p.; vol. 3, 440 p.; vol. 4, 532 p. (In Mong. And Russ.).
- Samples of Ritual Utensils of the Reigning Dynasty. Yangzhou: Guangling Shushe, 2004. 812 p. (In Chin.).
- Veritable Records of Sejong. Gwon 133: The Five Rituals. Introductory Notes. Weapons. Armor and Helmets. On: Veritable Records of Joseon Dynasty (online database). Available at: http://sillok.history.go.kr/id/kca_11411004_001 (accessed: March 19, 2021). (In Chin.)
- Veritable Records of Taejong. 1431. On: Veritable Records of Joseon Dynasty (online database). Available at: <http://sillok.history.go.kr/search/inspectionMonthList.do?id=kca>. (accessed: March 11, 2021). (In Chin.).

Literature

- Anisimova 2013 - *Anisimova M. A.* Weapons of the Orient XV - first half of XX century: from the collection of the Military Historical Museum of Artillery, Engineering and Signal Corps. SPb.: Atlant, 2013. 527 c.
- Akhmetzhan 2005 - *Akhmetzhan K. S.* Combat armour in the traditional system of arms of Kazakhs // Equipment of Eurasian nomads. Barnaul: Alt. State Univ. C. 82-86.
- Akhmetzhan 2007 - *Akhmetzhan K. S.* Ethnography of traditional arms of the Kazakhs. Almaty: Almaty Kitap, 2007. 216 c.
- Bakaeva 2017 - *Bakaeva E. P.* On the semantics of cut and décor of women's Tsegdek-type dress among Kalmyks and Oirats (ancient signs in the semiotic system of costume) // Oriental studies (Bulletin of the Kalmyk Institute for Humanities Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences). 2017. T. 10. № 4. C. 49-59.
- Beibutova 1986 - *Beibutova R.A.* Weaponry of the Kyrgyz epic hero and its ethnolinguistic explanation // All-Union School of Young Orientalists. Moscow: Nauka, 1986. T. 1. C. 17-19.
- Bekmakhanov 1992 - *Bekmakhanov E.* Kazakhstan in 20-40 years of XIX c. Alma-Ata: Kazak University, 1992. 400 c.
- Bobrov 2012 - *Bobrov L. A.* Kazakh military cap "malakai" of XVIII-XIX centuries // Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University. Series: History, Philology. 2012. T. 11. № 7: Archaeology and ethnography. C. 213-220.
- Bobrov 2013 - *Bobrov L. A.* Spear "cut-off" as an original constructive element of long-trunk weapons of the Great Steppe and adjacent territories of the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Age // Vestnik of Novosibirsk State University. Series: History, Philology. 2013. T. 12. no. 3: Archaeology and ethnography. C. 183-195.
- Bobrov 2015 - *Bobrov L. A.* Kazakh fighting narrow-bladed axes "shakan" of XVIII- XIX centuries // Archaeology, Ethnography and Anthropology of Eurasia. 2015. T. 43. № 4. C. 106-113.
- Bobrov 2021 - *Bobrov L. A.* Manchurian nobleman's armour of the first half to the middle of the 17th century // *Parabellum novum*. 2021. № 14 (47). C. 60-82.
- Bobrov, Ismailov 2019 - *Bobrov L.A., Ismailov D.* Three sabers with wooden handles from the late 17th-mid 19th centuries from the National Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan // Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University. Series: History, Philology. 2019. T. 18. № 3: Archaeology and ethnography. C. 146-158.
- Bobrov and Ozheredov 2013 - *Bobrov L. A., Ozheredov Y. I.* Kalantar shell from Central Asia (From the history of the MAES TSU "arms" collection) // Cultures and peoples of North and Central Asia in the context of interdisciplinary study. Vol. 3. Tomsk: Tomsk. State University, 2013. C. 42-63.
- Bobrov, Ozheredov 2021 - *Bobrov L. A., Ozheredov Y. I.* Jamsar warrior's armour. Central Asian armor-"kuyak" from the collection of the MAES TSU. Novosibirsk: IPC NSU, 2021. 228 c.

History

- Bobrov, Pastukhov 2021 - *Bobrov L. A., Pastukhov A. M.* "Qindin Huangyu Xiyu tuzhi" as a source on weapons and military symbols of the Central Asian population of the mid-18th century // *Bylynye Yody*. 2021. T. 16. № 2. C. 506-526.
- Bobrov, Pronin 2014 - *Bobrov L. A., Pronin A. O.* Kazakh battle axes in iso-brazilian sources of XVIII-XIX centuries // *Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University. Series: History, Philology*, 2014. T. 13. no. 5: Archaeology and ethnography. C. 255-262.
- Bobrov and Khudyakov 2008 - *Bobrov L. A. and Khudyakov Y. S.* Armament and tactics of the nomads of Central Asia and South Siberia in the late Middle Ages and the Modern Age (XV - first half of XVIII centuries). St. Petersburg: Faculty of Philology and Arts, SPbSU, 2008. 770 c.
- Valikhanov 1961 - *Valikhanov Ch. Valikhanov 1961 - Valikhanov Ch.* Weaponry Kyrgyz in ancient times and their military armor // *Collected Works: in 5 vols.* T. 1. C. 463-467.
- Darzha 2013 - *Darzha V. K.* Traditional male activities of Tuvinians. T. 1. Household-
The history of the region is very different from that of other regions. Kyzyl: OAO Tyvapoligraf, 2013. 592 c.
- Zakharova, Khodjaeva 1964 - *Zakharova I.V., Khodjaeva R.D.* Kazakh national clothes (XIX - the beginning of XX century). Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1964. 178 c.
- Loseva-Bakhtiyarova 2018 - *Loseva-Bakhtiyarova T. V.* Names of protective armor and equipment in the Turkic languages // *Philology. International scientific journal*. 2018. № 4(16). C. 65-74.
- Liubu chengyu zhujie 1987 - Liubu chengyu zhujie (= Interpretation of words used in the Six Offices). Hangzhou: Zhejiang gujai chubanshe, 1987. 237 c. (In Chinese) Mazarchuk 2017 - *Mazarchuk A. V.* Common Mongolian vocabulary of the section "Headdresses and Ornaments" in Khalkha, Buryat, and Kalmyk languages // *Bulletin of the Kalmyk Institute for Humanities Research (= Oriental Studies), RAS*. 2017. № 6. C. 94-102. DOI: 10.22162/2075-7794-2017-34-6-94-102
- Orlenko, Novoselov, Kurmanovsky 2019 - *Orlenko S.P., Novoselov V.R., Kurmanovsky V.* C. On the issue of the Bulat weapon of the Russian work of the 17th century (on the materials of the former archive of the Armoury Chamber) // *Historical Arms Science*. 2019. № 7. C. 1-61.
- Purbeyev 2009 - *Purbeyev G. II.* Military terminology in Mongolian-Oiratian laws "Ikh Tsaz and Khalkha Jirum" // *United Kalmykia in United Russia: through centuries into the future: proceedings of the international scientific conference devoted to the 400th anniversary of the voluntary joining of Kalmyk people to the Russian state (Elista, September 13-18, 2009)*. Elista: Dzhangar Scientific and Production Enterprise, 2009. PART 2. PP. 283-285.
- RKO 1972 - Russian-Chinese relations in the 17th century: materials and documents. In 2 vols. VOL. II. 1686-1691 / Inst. of the Far East. Russian Far East Institute, Institute of Oriental Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences; compiled and edited by N.F. Demidova and V. S. Myasnikov. S. Myasnikov. Moscow: Nauka, 1972. 836 c.
- RKO 1978 - Russian-Chinese relations in the 18th century. Materials and documents / Institute of the Far East. USSR Academy of Sciences, Institute of the Far East; ed. L. Tikhvinsky; comp: N. F. Demidova, V. S. Myasnikov, G. I. Sarkisova. VOL. I. 1700-1725. Moscow: Nauka, 1978. 704 c.
- Russian-Mongolian Relations 1996 - *Russian-Mongolian Relations 1654-1685: Collection of Documents. Materials on History / G.I. Slesarchuk (co-editor), N.F. Demidova (ed.)*. Moscow: Vost. lit., 1996. 560 c.
- Deadly Beauty 2015 - *Deadly Beauty. Weapons of India and China. Exhibition catalogue / author-compiler: E. Karlova M., Pastukhov A.M., Popov A.Y., Uspenskaya E.N.* MOSCOW: GMV, 2015. 368 c.
- CHGDC 2002 - *Zhongguo gudai qiu da qidian. Bingqi, Xingyu (= Great Dictionary of the Material Culture of China of the Past Era. Weapons, instruments of punishment)*. Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 2002. 516 c. (in Chinese).
- Shkolyar 1980 - *Shkolyar S.A.* Chinese pre-fire artillery. Moscow: Nauka, 1980. 406 c.
- Alexander 2015 - *Alexander D. G.* Islamic Arms and Armor in the Metropolitan Museum

- Armaments and Military 2008 - Armaments and Military Provisions. The Complete Collection of Treasures of the Palace Museum. Beijing: Commercial Press, 2008. 264 p.
- Khorasani 2006 - *Khorasani M. M.* Arms and Armour from Iran. The Bronze Age to the End of the Qajar Period. Tübingen: Legat-Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, 2006. 776 p.
- LaRocca 2006 - *LaRocca D. J.* Warriors of the Himalayas. Rediscovering the Arms and Armor of Tibet. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2006. 307 p.
- The Arts... 2008 - The Arts of the Muslim Knight. The Furusiyya Art Foundation Collection. By Bashir Mohamed. Milan: Skira, 2008. 416 p.
- Rivkin, Isaac 2017 - *Rivkin K., Isaac B.* A Study of the Eastern Sword. Mankato: Yamna Publishing, 2017. 360 p.

References

- Akhmetzhan K. S. Combat armor in the Kazakh traditional weapon system. In: Military Equipment of Eurasian Nomads. Barnaul: Altai State University, 2005. Pp. 82-86. (In Russ.).
- Akhmetzhan K. S. Ethnography of Kazakh Traditional Weaponry. Almaty: Almatykitap, 2007. 216 p. (In Russ.).
- Alexander D. G. Islamic Arms and Armour in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2015. 336 p. (In Eng.).
- Anisimova M. A. Military Historical Museum of Artillery, Engineers and Signal Corps: Weapons of the East, 15th - Mid-20th Centuries. St. Petersburg: Atlant, 2013. 527 p. (In Russ.).
- Bakaeva E. P. P. The *tsegdeg* dress of Kalmyk and Oirat women: semantics of its fashion and decorative elements (ancient signs in the semiotic system of the garment). *Bulletin of the Kalmyk Institute for Humanities of the RAS (Oriental Studies)*. 2017. Vol. 10. No. 4. Pp. 49-59. (In Russ.)
- Bekmakhanov E. Kazakhstan, 1920s-1940s. Alma-Ata: Kazakh State University, 1992. 400 p. (In Russ.)
- Beybutova R. A. Kyrgyz epic hero: his weaponry and ethnolinguistic interpretation of the latter. In: All-Union School of Young Orientalists. Moscow, 1986. Vol. 1. Pp. 17-19. (In Russ.)
- Bobrov L. A. thArmor of the Manchu aristocrat, the first half and the middle of the 1700 century. *Parabellum novum*. 2021. No. 14 (47). Pp. 60-82. (In Russ.)
- Bobrov L. A. Kazakh military cap 'malakai', XVIII-XIX centuries. *Vestnik NSU. Series: History and Philology*. 2012. Vol. 11. No. 7: Archaeology and Ethnography. Pp. 213-220. (In Russ.).
- Bobrov L. A. Shakan: Kazakh 18th -19th century narrow-bladed battle axes. *Archaeology, Ethnology and Anthropology of Eurasia*. 2015. Vol. 43. No. 4. Pp. 106-113. (In Russ.)
- Bobrov L. A. Spear cut - structural element of long pole weapons of the nations of the Great Steppe and neighboring territories dated to the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern age. *Vestnik NSU. Series: History and Philology*. 2013. Vol. 12. no. 3: Archaeology and Ethnography. Pp. 183-195. (In Russ.)
- Bobrov L. A., Ismailov D. Three sabers with wooden hilts from the 17th - mid 19th centuries from the National Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Vestnik NSU. Series: History and Philology*. 2019. Vol. 18. no. 3: Archaeology and Ethnography. Pp. 146-158. (In Russ.)
- Bobrov L. A., Khudyakov Yu. S. Nomads of Central Asia and South Siberia: Weaponry and Tactics of War in the Late Medieval Ages and Early Modern Era, 15th - Mid-18th Centuries AD. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University, 2008. 770 p. (In Russ.).
- Bobrov L. A., Ozheredov Yu. I. Armor of the Warrior Jamsaran: Central Asian 'Kuyak' Armor from the Museum of Siberian Archaeology and Ethnography, Tomsk State University. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State University, 2021. 228 p. (In Russ.).
- Bobrov L. A., Ozheredov Yu. I. Museum of Siberian Archaeology and Ethnography, Tomsk State University: Kalantar armor from Central Asia. In: Cultures and Peoples of



History

- University, 2013. Pp. 42-63. (In Russ.).
- Bobrov L. thA., Pastukhov A. M. 'Qinding Huangyu Xiyu Tuzhi' as a source of the information of weapons and military symbols for the population of Central Asia in the middle of the 18th century. *Bylye Gody*. 2021. Vol. 16. No. 2. Pp. 506-526. (In Russ.).
- Bobrov L. A., Pronin A. O. Kazakh battle axes in XVIII-XIX centuries in pictorial sources. *Vestnik NSU. Series: History and Philology*. 2014. Vol. 13. No. 5: Archaeology and Ethnography. Pp. 255-262. (In Russ.).
- Darzha V. K. Traditional Occupations of Tuvan Men. Vol. 1: Livestock Breeding, Hunting, Fishing. Kyzyl: Tyvapoligraf, 2013. 592 p. (In Russ.).
- Demidova N. F. et al. (comps.), Tikhvinsky S. L. (ed.) Russian-Chinese Relations, 18th Century: Materials and Documents. Vol. I: 1700-1725. Moscow: Nauka, 1978. 704 p. (In Russ.) Demidova N. F., Myasnikov V. S. (comps.) Russian-Chinese Relations, 17th Century. Vol. II: 1686-1691. Moscow: Nauka, 1972. 836 p. (In Russ.).
- Interpretations of Words Used in the Six Ministries. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Ancient Books Publ., 1987. 237 p. (In Chin.).
- Karlova E. M. et al. Mortal Beauty: Arms and Armour of India and China. Exhibition catalogue. Moscow: State Museum of Oriental Art, 2015. 368 p. (In Russ.).
- Khorasani M. M. Arms and Armour from Iran. The Bronze Age to the End of the Qajar Period. Tübingen: Legat-Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, 2006. 776 p. (In Eng.).
- LaRocca D. J. Warriors of the Himalayas. Rediscovering the Arms and Armour of Tibet. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2006. 307 p. (In Eng.).
- Loseva-Bakhtiyarova T. V. The names of protective armors and equipment in the Turkic languages. *PHILOLOGY. International scientific journal*. 2018. No. 4 (16). Pp. 65-74. (In Russ.).
- Mazarchuk A. V. Common lexis for headgears and adornments in Khalkha, Buryat, and Kalmyk. *Bulletin of the Kalmyk Institute for Humanities of the RAS (Oriental Studies - Elista)*. 2017. No. 6. Pp. 94-102. (In Russ.) DOI: 10.22162/2075-7794-2017-34-6-94-102
- Mohamed B. The Arts of the Muslim Knight. The Furusiyya Art Foundation Collection. Milan: Skira, 2008. 416 p. (In Eng.).
- Orlenko S. P. P., Novosyolov V. R., Kurmanovsky V. S. Revisiting the Russian weapons from crucible steel in the 17th century (a case study of the former archive of the Armoury Chamber). *Weapons History Journal*. 2019. No. 7. Pp. 1-61. (In Russ.).
- Pyurbeev G. Ts. Ikh Tsaaz and Khalkha Jirum: military terms in the codes of Oirats and Mongols. In: United Kalmykia in United Russia: Through Centuries into the Future. Jubilee conference proceedings (Elista; September 13-18, 2009). Elista: Dzhangar, 2009. Vol. 2. Pp. 283-285. (In Russ.).
- Rivkin K., Isaac B. A Study of the Eastern Sword. Mankato, 2017. 360 p. (In Eng.)
- Shkolyar S. A. Kitayskaya doognestrel'naya artilleriya. M.: Nauka, 1980. 406 s.
- Slesarchuk G. I. (comp.), Demidova N. F. (ed.) Russian-Mongolian Relations, 1654-1685: Historical Materials. Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura, 1996. 560 p. (In Russ.).
- The Complete Collection of Treasures of the Palace Museum. Armaments and Military Provisions. Beijing, 2008. 264 p. (In Eng.).
- Unabridged Dictionary of China's Material Culture from Past Eras. Weapons and Instruments of Punishment. Shijiazhuang: Hebei Educational Press, 2002. 516 p. (In Chin.).
- Valikhanov Ch. Ch. Kirghiz weaponry and armor in ancient times. In: Valikhanov Ch. Collected Works. In 5 vols. Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1961. Vol. 1. Pp. 463-467. (In Russ.)
- Zakharova I. V., Khodzhaeva R. D. Kazakh National Garments, 19th - Early 20th Centuries. Alma-Ata: Nauka, 1964. 178 p. (In Russ.).