secure. The occasional similarities of thought and expression between them and the Lucan writings suggest that the period of their origin lies within a quarter of a century after Paul’s death, and, when one or two later accretions are admitted, the internal evidence, either upon the organization of the church@@1 or upon the errors controverted, tallies with this hypothesis.

Literature.—Special monographs on this epistle by Leo (1850) and Bahnsen *(Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe, I., der 2 Tim.,* 1876) are to be noted. For a textual discussion of ii. 19, cf. Resch’s *Paulinismus,* pp. 258-259. The allusion to the *βιβλία, μάλιστα* τás *µeµßpàvas* (iv. 13) has produced a wealth of discussion; the latter were probably *pugiltares membranei,* sheets for private memoranda. The books may have included the Logia or Evangeli Scriptures from which 1 Tim. v. 18 is quoted (so Resch), but this is a mere conjecture. Cf., on the whole question, Birt's *Das antike Buchwesen,* pp. 50 seq., 65, 88 seq., and Nestle’s *Einführung in das griechische N. T.* (1899), pp. 39 seq. (J. Mτ.)

**TIMÜR** *(Timur i Leng,* the lame Timur), commonly known as Tamerlane, the renowned Oriental conqueror, was born in 1336 at Kesh, better known as Shahr-i-Sabz, “ the green city,” situated some 50 m. south of Samarkand in Transoxiana. His father Teragai was head of the tribe of Berlas. Great-grandson of Karachar Nevian (minister of Jagatai, son of Jenghiz Khan, and commandcr-in-chief of his forces), and distinguished among his fellow-clansmen as the first convert to Islamism, Teragai might have assumed the high military rank which fell to him by right of inheritance; but like his father Burkul he preferred a life of retirement and study. Under the paternal eye the education of young Timur was such that at the age of twenty he had not only become an adept in manly outdoor exercises but had earned the reputation of being an attentive reader of the Koran. At this period, if we may credit the *Memoirs (Malfuzat),* he exhibited proofs of a tender and sympathetic nature.

About 1358, however, he came before the world as a leader of armies. His career for the next ten or eleven years may be thus briefly summarized from the *Memoirs.* Allying himself both in cause and by family connexion with Kurgan, the dethroner and destroyer of Kazan, chief of the western Jagatai, he was deputed to invade Khorasan at the head of a thousand horse. This was the second warlike expedition in which he was the chief actor, and the accomplishment of its objects led to further operations, among them the subjection of Khwarizm and Urganj. After the murder of Kurgan the contentions which arose among the many claimants to sovereign power were arrested by the invasion of Toghluk Timur of Kashgar, a descendant of Jenghiz. Timür was despatched on a mission to the invader’s camp, the result of which was his own appointment to the government of Mâwarä- ,lnahr (Transoxiana). By the death of his father he was also left hereditary head of the Berlas. The exigencies of his quasi-sovereign position compelled him to have recourse to his formidable patron, whose reappearance on the banks of the Sihon created a consternation not easily allayed. Mãwarã’lnahr was taken from Timür and entrusted to a son of Toghluk; but he was defeated in battle by the bold warrior he had replaced at the head of a numerically far inferior force. Toghluk’s death facilitated the work of reconquest, and a few years of perse­verance and energy sufficed for its accomplishment, as well as for the addition of a vast extent of territory. During this period Timür and his brother-in-law, Hosain—at first fellow­fugitives and wanderers in joint adventures full of interest and romance—became rivals and antagonists. At the close of 1369 Hosain was assassinated and Timür, having been formally proclaimed sovereign at Balkh, mounted the throne at Samarkand, the capital of his dominions.

The next thirty years or so were spent in various wars and expeditions. Timür not only consolidated his rule at home by the subjection of intestine foes, hut sought extension of territory by encroachments upon the lands of foreign potentates. His conquests to the west and north-west led him among the Mongols of the Caspian and to the banks of the Ural and the Volga;

those to the south and south-west comprehended almost every province in Persia, including Bagdad, Kerbela and Kurdistan. One of the most formidable of his opponents was Toktamish, who after having been a refugee at the court of Timür became ruler both of the eastern Kipchak and the Golden Horde, and quarrelled with Timür over the possession of Khwarizm. It was not until 1395 that the power of Toktamish was finally broken (see Mongols; Golden Horde).

In 1398, when Timür was more than sixty years of age, Farishta tells us that, “ informed of the commotions and civil wars of India,” he “ began his expedition into that country,” and on the 12th of September “arrived on the banks of the Indus.” His passage of the river and upward march along the left bank, the reinforcement he provided for his grandson Pir Mahommed (who was invested in Multan), the capture of towns or villages accompanied, it might be, with destruction of the houses and the massacre of the inhabitants, the battle before Delhi and the easy victory, the triumphal entry into the doomed city, with its outcome of horrors—all these circumstances belong to the annals of India. In April 1399, some three months after quitting the capital of Mahmud Toghluk, Timür was back in his own capital beyond the Oxus. It need scarcely be added that an immense quantity of spoil was conveyed away. Accord­ing to Clavijo, ninety captured elephants were employed merely to carry stones from certain quarries to enable the conqueror to erect a mosque at Samarkand. The war with the Turks and Egyptians which succeeded the return from India was rendered notable by the capture of Aleppo and Damascus, and especially by the defeat and imprisonment of Sultan Bayezid I. (see Turkey: *History,* and Egypt: *History,* Mahommedan period). This was Timür’s last campaign. Another was projected against China, but the old warrior was attacked by fever and ague when encamped on the farther side of the Sihon (Syr-Daria) and died at Atrãr (Otrar) on the 17th of February 1405. Mark­ham, in his introduction to the narrative of Clavijo’s embassy, states that his body “ was embalmed with musk and rose water, wrapped in linen, laid in an ebony coffin and sent to Samarkand, where it was buried.” Timür had carried his victorious arms on one side from the Irtish and the Volga to the Persian Gulf and on the other from the Hellespont to the Ganges.

Timur’s generally recognized biographers are—'All Yazdî, commonly called Sharifu ’d-Dîn, author of the Persian *Zafar- nãma,* translated by Petis de la Croix in 1722, and from French into English by J. Darby in the following year; and Ahmad ibn Mohammed ibn Abdallah, al Dimashki, al 'Ajmi, commonly called Ibn ’Ãrabshãh, author of the Arabic *'Λfaibu Ί Makhlnkãt,* trans­lated by the Dutch Orientalist Golius in 1636. In the work of the former, as Sir William Jones remarks, “ the Tartarian conqueror is represented as a liberal, benevolent, and illustrious prince”; in that of the latter he is “ deformed and impious, of a low birth and detestable principles.” But the favourable account was written under the personal supervision of Timür’s grandson, Ibrãhïm, while the other was the production of his direst enemy. Few in­deed, if any, original annals of this class are written otherwise than to order, under patronage, or to serve a purpose to which truth is secondary. Among less reputed biographies or materials for biography may be mentioned a second *Zafarnäma,* by Maulãnã Nizãmu ’d-Dîn Shanab Ghãzâni (Nizãm Shãmï), stated to be “the earliest known history of Timür, and the only one written in his lifetime”; and vol. i. of the *Matla'u's-Saldain—*a choice Persian MS. work of 1495—introduced to Orientalists in Europe by Hammer, Jahrbücher, Porn and (notably) Quatremère. There are also the *Memoirs (Malfüizãt')* and *Institutes (Tuzukãf),* of which an important section is styled *Designs and Enterprises (Γadbιrat wa Kangãshaha).* Upon the genuineness of these doubt has been throwrn. The circumstance of their alleged discovery and presenta­tion to Shah Jahãn in 1637 was of itself open to suspicion. Alhazen, quoted by Purchas in his quaint notice of Timur and referred to by Sir John Malcolm, can hardly be accepted as a serious authority. His assumed memoir was printed for English readers in 1597 by William Ponsonby under the title of a *Historie of the Great Emperor Tamerlan, drawn from the ancient monuments by Messire Jean du Bee, Abbot of Mortimer',* and another version of the same book is to be found in the *Histoire du Grand Tamerlan,* by De Sainctyon, published at Amsterdam in 1678. But, although the existence of this Alhazen of Jean de Bee has been believed by many, the more trustworthy critics consider the history and historian to be equally fictitious.

Reference may be made to two more sources of information.

@@@1 The pastorals in this aspect are closer to Clemens Romanus than to Ignatius.