

(1975), pp. 404–446; and “Die europäische Expansion und die Transformation Ägyptens 1760–1922,” in Jan-Heeren Grevemeyer, ed., *Traditionale Gesellschaften und europäischer Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt, 1981), pp. 137–157.

The reviewer also seems to believe that I wished to deny the principle on which the ʿUrābiyūn acted. I do not think so. It is placarded on the cover of the book, *Egypt for the Egyptians*, and it is the red thread which runs through the study.

Finally, I wish to point out that due to an unfortunate and most painful error, a copy of the English translation was published which I had not checked before it went to the printer. This is mainly problematic in the footnotes, the meaning of some of which is rather distorted. Scholars who need to see the full and proper documentation have therefore to be referred to the original German edition.

*University of Essen*

ALEXANDER SCHÖLCH

To the Editor:

In my initial leafing-through of *JMES* 15:2 (May 1983), the following sentence in Akbar Aghajanian’s article, “Ethnic Inequality in Iran: An Overview,” caught my eye: “The Turkish mother tongue is Azari or Azarbayjani, which is structurally similar to Turkish but with a strikingly different dialect” (p. 212). Note 6 (p. 223) to this sentence reads: “Several writers argue that Azari does not have a Turkish origin and is another dialect of the Persian language,” and goes on to refer to works by Kasravi and Mortazavi. These comments represent a curious misunderstanding of facts and misreading (or not reading) of the sources mentioned.

The historian Ahmad Kasravi, himself a native of Azarbayjan, discovered that medieval Arab historians and geographers refer to the language of the area as *al-Ādhariya*, i.e., Āzarī, which they recognized as related to Persian. Turkish was introduced there with the coming of the Saljuqs in the early fifth century, A.H., and only by the end of the Safavi rule (circa 1,150 A.H.) did it, for all practical purposes, completely displace Āzarī, of which, however, a few isolated relics still exist.

Kasravi first published his findings in 1925. A 1938 expanded and improved version, entitled *Āzarī yā Zabān-i Bāstan-i Āzarbaygān* (Azari or the Ancient Language of Azarbayjan), can now be read (with the introduction omitted) in Y. Zukāʿ, *Kārvand-i Kasravī* (Tehran: Ketābhā-yī Jībī, 1973), pp. 317–374. A somewhat detailed review of the original edition, containing a summary of the book, was published by Sir Denison Ross in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1927), pp. 148–157.

As Turkish became firmly established in the province, the memory of its original language, Āzarī, faded away. Careless usage led to the use of “Turk” as an ethnic term for Iranian Azarbayjanis.

The use of “Azari” for “Azarbayjani Turkish” has led to scientifically indefensible assumptions. Its continued misuse even after Kasravi’s rediscovery of its correct meaning almost 60 years ago is unjustified. We would all do well to restore “Azari” to its correct meaning.

Finally, a Persian-speaking scholar’s misrepresentation of facts set down in simple language in Kasravi’s easily accessible monograph is a warning to us all that secondary and tertiary sources must be read with due scepticism and checked against the original sources.

*The University of Texas at Austin*

M. A. JAZAYERI