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corner-stones of the Ka‘ba and as such we must consider also the Ma‘akam Idrīhim.


**SANâR** (P., a corruption of *sâd a’mâr*), the name given in the reign of Fâth ‘Ali Shah of Persia (1212—1250 = 1797—1834) to a silver coin, the half *‘abāzâr or mahmûd*; it weighed 36 grains (2.34 grammes). With its multiples it was abolished at Fâth ‘Ali’s reform of the currency in the thirtieth year of his reign.

(J. ALLAN)

**SANDÂBIL**, said to be the capital of China. The name and description of the town in Yâkût (Mu‘jam, iii. 451, 5) and Zakariyâ al-Kazwini (Adîjib al-Maklûjît, ii. 30 sq.) are taken from the undoubtedly fraudulent story of his travels by Abû Dulaf Mis‘âr b. Muhâlîh (see the art. MIS‘AR), who claims to have accompanied an embassy of the Chinese king Khârîn b. al-Shâkî to the Sâmânîd Naṣr b. Aḥmad († 331 = 943) from Khûrusân back to China. J. Marquart (*Ostasiatische und ostasiatische Strassengänge*, Leipzig 1903, p. 84 sq., esp. p. 89) endeavours to show that Sandâbil and Kan-ĉou (cf. the art. KANSU) are identical and that we have to see in the sender of the embassy "not a prince of one of the short-lived dynasties after the fall of the T’ang dynasty but the Khaqân of the Ulugs of Kan-ĉou". This Khâgân is said "to have felt threatened by the steadily increasing power of the Kitân" and "to have sought support and an alliance from the powerful Sâmânîd". On the question of the origin of the name Sandâbil for Kan-ĉou, Marquart only gives the suggestion made to him by the German envoy that Kan-ĉou was used as Kan-ĉou with Čing-tâu (in Marco Polo Sindafu), well known as the capital of the province of Ch‘âwan, where a separate dynasty actually did rule at that time. According to Marquart, "the latter town must be considered to have been the starting point of the return journey", which is obviously impossible as the return journey is described as being made by sea. So long as Abû Dulaf’s story is not confirmed from any other source, the question will remain unsettled what relation his story of his journey and the alleged reason for it has to historical facts. Where there is there the slightest mention of embassies from China to Khûrusân or vice versa nor of the matrimonial alliance said to have been arranged (Yâkût, iii. 45, 99).

(W. BARTHOLD)

**SANDAL**, Sandalwood. According to al-Nu‘airî, numerous varieties are distinguished. The majority, especially the white, yellow and red kinds, are used for the manufacture of fragrant powders on account of their pleasant smell; they are also used in medicine, while other varieties again are used by turners and furniture-makers or for the manufacture of chessmen, etc. At the present day the *Psychotropa* imported from Southern Asia, the islands of the Malay Archipelago and Africa is used for fine furniture and the waste as dyes-woods.


**SANDJAK** (n. t.), 1) flag, standard, banner (Arabic *izāq*), especially of a large size (more important than the *boyrak*, *râyâ* or *çalam*) important for fixing in the ground or hoisted permanently on a monument or a ship; 2) (nautical term) ensign; pennant (*tikindji sandjak*); starboard; 3) formerly a military file or *çâfiz* of a certain extent in the Ottoman empire; 4) a Turkish administrative and territorial division; 5) (in the expression *sandjak tiken-i* or *dikeyn-i*, from the Turkish translation of *burhân-i kâfi*, p. 88, 29) a synonym of *sandjan* *tiken-i* (on this plant see Barbier de Meynard [ii. 101], who gives it as a Persian word).

As al-Kâlaqânî points out in the xvi. century (*Suhb al-‘âdâb*, v. 458), *sandjâb* comes from the verb *sandjâb* (not *sandjâb*, as in the author already quoted) which means "to sing, pricke, plant, stick a weapon or pointed object in the body of an enemy or in the ground (cf. Šam-Bej, *K Raschî*; Türkî). The form *sandjâb* found in *Câbâtî* (Boudong) and even in an old Serbian loanword (Miklosich, *Die tschechischen Elemente in den südosteuropäischen Sprachen*, Vienna 1884, 110) corresponds to the verb *sanjâb* of the *Orkhon inscriptions* (v. Thomsen, p. 42; Radloff, p. 132). Cf. also F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica*, ii. 78, 30 and 86, 48. In Kirghiz the form used is *chânjab* (Radloff, *Wörterbuch*, iv. 949) and in Uriankhay *chânjâb* and *tânjâb* (Katanov, *Opf. tišđekowia*, p. 429 and 779, with the meaning "to prickle, stab, erect, fix"). Mahmûd al-Kâshghari (xii. cent.), *Dâwân Lâqîjît* al-Türk., ii. 171, 180, 182 and iii. 370, also gives (iii. 108) *sandjâb* equivalent to *sandjan* (*sandjan*) already quoted, which is a Turkish participle used as the name of a prickly plant.

The word *sandjâb* belongs to a family of derivatives which all contain the idea of "point" and mean (the word itself sometimes): harpoon, fork, piercing pain, colic. Such are *sandjâb*, sandjâk, sandjâk, tanjâk (Tobolisk), *tânjâb* (Kirghiz), *sandjâzî*, sandjî (whence *sandjâb* in Old Manichi). We may add on the authority of Abu ‘l-Fida‘ and the Turk.-Arab glossary published by Houtsma, Leiden 1894, p. 50 and p. 29 of the Arabic text, the proper name *Sandjar*, glossed *wâfan*, in preference to the usually accepted etymology from *sandjar* to his place of birth (cf. *Reise des Historiers des Crusader*, i. 1872; cf. Index under *Sandjar*).

*Sandjâb* has passed into a certain number of other languages; more recently also into the Baltic languages (cf. the work by Miklosich quoted above and Saineau, *Influence Orientale*) and earlier into Arabic (cf. Doxy, *Suppl.*; cf. also W. Marquis, *Le dictionnaire arabe de Tlemcen*, Paris 1902, p. 379, 99, 90) and into Persian where, according to the *Burhân-i kâfi*, it means or meant a "flag, a large metal pin intended to keep on the head a kind of hood for women"; a "kind of girdle". In Modern Persian *sandjik* (sic) simply means "pin" (in opposition to "needle") (cf. Nicolas,
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struction of a mole. But the expense which these works necessitated along with other causes helped to make the occupation of Tangier very unpopular in England. Thus it was under very favourable conditions that the ‘Alawi Sulṭān Mawlay Ismā‘il decided to lay siege to the town. This siege lasted not less than six years. An army was gathered together to blockade Tangier and the attacks on the advanced position of the system of defences were successful from the year 1678. As the siege became more and more severe, the English decided to evacuate the town after blowing up the mole and the most important fortifications. On February 6th, 1684 the garrison and the English population embarked with the last governor, Lord Dartmouth, and Tangier became once more a Muslim town.

The Moroccan governor, who was appointed to the command of Tangier, named Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Ḥasan ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Tamāmání al-Rifi, at once proceeded to rebuild the town which had been left in ruins by the English. He, and after him his son, became sufficiently powerful throughout the district to be able soon to withstand Mawlay ‘Abd Allāh, the successor of Mawlay Ismā‘il, and to give an asylum to the pretenders to the dynasty. In later times also, the governors of Tangier who nearly all belonged to the same family had no hesitation in occasionally throwing off the authority of the sultāns. The history of the relations of these governors with the makhzen is the history of Tangier until the sixteenth century.

On August 6th, 1584 Tangier was bombarded by a French squadron under the command of the Prince de Joinville. Eight days afterwards the Moroccan forces were routed at the battle of El Jadida.

It is unnecessary to quote here the successive agreements come to between the European powers and Morocco which ended in the elaboration and adoption of the statute under which Tangier and its zone are at present ruled, along with the zone of Spanish influence and the zone of French influence in Morocco. A railway from Tangier to Fās and to Rabāṭ has been open since the year 1927.

Bibliography: A good monograph on Tangier with documents, statistics, illustrations and maps has been published under the title of "Tanger et sa zone" being volume vii. of the collection "Villes et tribus du Maroc", Documents et renseignements publiés par la Section Sociologique de la Résidence Générale de la République Française au Maroc, Paris 1921. The "Archives Marocaines", Paris 1904–1920 also contain a number of documents on Tangier. For the Portuguese occupation the principal contemporary source is the "Historia de Tangier" of D. Fernando de Menezes, Lisbon 1732. Tangier has been the subject of many descriptions by travellers (chiefly English) in the sixteenth century. A list of them can be found in Playfair’s Bibliography of Morocco, London 1892. In conclusion, the Arabic dialect spoken by the citizens of Tangier has been the subject of a masterly study by William Marçais, Textes arabes de Tanger, Paris 1911, based on the works of Lüderitz, Meissner, Blanc, Marchand and Kampfmeyer. These texts besides their linguistic interest contain valuable information about society and native life in Tangier.

(E. Lévy-Provençal)
and they call a wise man tängrikän”. This word tängrikän appears also as an old Turk title (cf. Radloff, Wörterbuch, iii. 1048; F. W. K. Müller, Urgurica, p. 47: tängrikän = ruler). With the meaning “God” (in the Manichean system) we find tängrikän for instance in the Manichean confession of sins (Chaukhanf, ed. A. von le Coq, 1911, p. 10). The word tängrim (i.e. tängri with the pronominal suffix of the first person) seems to be used in the Turfan texts in the titles of princesses or queens (cf. F. W. K. Müller, Urgurica, p. 48, who compares the modern usage of khanım and bégan). We may here give a few derivatives of tängri: tängriti or tängiri (in the Manichean confession of sins, cf. J. R. A. S., 1912, p. 289, 299) = preacher, chosen one (lit. man of God); Kuman, tänriltik = “divine”; Urgur, tänrikīt = “pious”. The Mongol tāgri (God) is a loanword from the Turkish (for this form cf. Bibl. Buddhica, xii. 51).

The etymologies proposed for the Turkish word (e.g. by Vámbéry and Barbier de Meynard, s.v.) are of no value. In most modern Central Asian dialects of Turkish tängrī has the two meanings “God” and “Heaven”; in Ottoman Turkish on the other hand the (rather obsolete) word has apparently only the meaning “God”. For idiomatic combinations of tänri, e.g. tänri devergelī = thousand-footed, cf. the Dictionaries of Radloff and Barbier de Meynard (s.v.).

To define the conceptions implied by the word tängrī so far as the beliefs of Turkish paganism is concerned, it will be advisable to deal first with the old Turkish inscriptions and then with the material collected in modern times from Teleut and Altai shamanism.

In the inscriptions tänri almost always appears as a divine power: it is by his will that the king attains to power; the king himself is “like tänri” and “born of tänri” (tänridag tänrida bolılmī) and installed by tänrī (tänri yaralımlī). Tänri protects the Turkish people, secures their continuance as a nation and gives the Turkish chiefs victory over their foes: in this quality of special protector of the Turks he is described as Türk tänriisi. Alongside of the God of Heaven we find a certain power over the fate of the people and the individual conceded to the spirits of earth and water (yir-sub); the highest deity however is Tänri.

There are however some passages where the term tänri does not imply any real personality. The “blue heaven above” (z̄a k̄k tänri) is created like the “dark earth below” (asra yağda yir) and mankind. Who created them is not stated. An important passage (V. Thomsen, Inscriptions de l’Orkhon, p. 112) records that a rising of the Oguz took place “because heaven and earth were in confusion”. Here we have clearly the influence of Chinese ideas of the nature of the universe, the theory which de Groot called “Universismus”. This need not surprise us because the Turkish chiefs who had the Orkhon inscriptions preserved lived within the area of Chinese cultural influences.

On the conception of tänri in modern Turkish shamanism (i.e. mainly among the Teleut and Altai Turks) cf. H. Vámbéry, Die primitive Cultur des Turko-Tatarischen Volkes, 1879, p. 150 sqq.; W. Radloff, Aus Sibirien, 1884, ii. 1 sqq. and the texts collected by Radloff in the first volume of his Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens. This paganism as might be expected, did not remain entirely free from foreign, e.g. Christian and Buddhist influences; when, for example, in a shaman’s conjuration we find the expressions Pyrkan Tengre and Pyrkan Kan (Radloff, Aus Sibirien, ii. 33, 44), it is natural to recognise in Pyrkan the Mongol (also old Turkish) word Burkhan = Buddha. That the pagan Turkish creation myth shows traces of Jewish, Christian and Buddhist influences was noted by Radloff himself (op. cit., ii. 5 sq.). When it is said that the evil spirit Erlik created a heaven for himself, like the god of heaven, one is tempted to think of Zoroastrian influence (the “counter-creations” of Ahriman).

According to Turkish shamanism the most powerful god, Tengere Kaïra Kan, created the heavens and also the evil spirit Erlik, the good spirits, mankind and the earth. The form tengere (following the orthography in Radloff) corresponds to the Teleut Tänürü and Altai Tänürü. Kaïra Kan must be identical with the Altai Kairakkan (cf. Radloff, Wörterbuch, ii. 22), a word used to describe gods and spirits; Tengere Kaïra Kan is therefore the “god of heaven”.

There are seventeen different regions in heaven arranged in succession one above the other; there the good spirits live. The highest of these minor deities are Bāi Ulgŏn, Kysagan Tengere and Mergen Tengere. The gods of heaven are not directly appealed to like the spirits of earth and of water but through the intermediary of the spirits of ancestors, i.e. a shaman (kam) is required for the purpose. In a Teleut shaman’s prayer (Radloff, Volksliteratur, i. 238) the heavens above are appealed to as the Creator. In an Altai myth (Radloff, ibid., i. 61 sqq.) a hero seeks the hand of the daughter of the god of heaven, Támân Ökô.

When it is said of the thunderstorm in the dialect of Kasan: “The old man of the heavens (tänri babai) is thundering”, this is a relic of old pagan ideas (cf. Radloff, Wörterbuch, ii. 1425; iii. 1047; iv. 1564).

Speaking generally one may say that, apart from foreign influences, so far as they can be eliminated, in the Turkish conception Tänri is regarded as the heavens as an element and also as the spirit ruling in heaven. This spirit was probably originally conceived as a kind of force, a something which would be called mana in modern ethnology. The conception of a personal god of heaven must have developed out of this.

When Turkish tribes took over other religions the word tängrī became the name for the god or higher beings of these religions. The meaning “heaven” was naturally driven into the background. To convey the conception of heaven the word k̄k (Ottoman gök) was used, which is originally the name of a colour (cf. Radloff, Wörterbuch, ii. 1220). In old Turkish we also find k̄k satri, the blue ether (Urgurica, p. 8, 18; Radloff, Wörterbuch, ii. 240).

In Buddhist old Turkish texts tängri corresponds to the Sanskrit deva “god”; in Buddhist mythology, a conception which is better conveyed by the word “angel” because this being lacks several qualities which to us are necessarily associated with the idea of “god”. The feminine equivalent devi is given by tängri k̄hān; tängri ṭēs is Turkish for devakanyā (divine maiden, aparás). The king of the gods (devarāja) Indra
is tângriîr îlî Khîmûsû; Bahmâ is called ĀsrâĂu tângri. These beings have thus Iranian names, Ohrmazd and (perhaps) Zarwân. The goddess Črî is called Kût Tângri Khâtâtûl or (without Khâtâtûl) Kût Tângriît. The name Kût Tângriît seems also to be given to Kubera (e.g. Mûller, Uigurica, p. 45). In a collection of dhârâpis for travellers, the Tïsâstutîk (ed. by W. Radloff and A. v. Stäel-Holstein, St. Petersburg 1910 = Bibl. Buddhica, xii.), we find a devâ named Tāng-rîdâm, whom Radloff takes for Kubera 'so that the latter has therefore another Türkîsh' name. But this is doubtful, for in one passage (p. 22) of this work, Kubera (Kûpîrî) is mentioned by name and Tāng-rîdâm is mentioned soon after as a different deity, but it must be allowed that in the text there are elsewhere illogicalities (cf. e.g. Turkish text, p. 23 sq.). For Kubera in this work cf. also p. 97, note 2; Buddha himself is often called Tângri Tângriît. The god of heaven (devâloka) is called in Türkîsh Tângri Yîr and the Vaimûnâka gods, as a rule peculiar to Jaina mythology, but also found e.g. in the Tïsâstutîk, are called Waimûnâkùnî-tângriît.

The Manîchiân Türkîsh terminology which is influenced by Buddhîsh (cf. Chüstutanîštî, ed. A. v. Le Coq, Berlin 1911, p. 5; J. R. A. S., 1891, p. 270) shows the word in the form we use: Tângri corresponds here to the Iranian Yand (or Bag); in the first place this means the highest principle of the Manîchiân system and secondly the subordinate spirits of light or gods (yaurûk tângriîrî) in contrast to the demons (yâklâr). The first man is called bîgû tângri, five-god (from his five components known from the Manîchiân myth: ether, wind, light, water and fire). The name tângri is also given to the five elements, e.g. oot tânârî = god of fire. Tângri is found with the meaning "heaven" (e.g. Chüstutanîštî, p. 16 = J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 291, l. 167). Paradise is called Tângri Yîr. This Manîchiân terminology corresponds pretty well to the Buddhîsh. One or two peculiarities may still be pointed out: the occurrence of the already mentioned term, tângriîrî (Chüstutanîštî, p. 10; J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 281, l. 22), in the name of a deity (ÅsrâĂu Tângriît) as translated by von le Coq (J. R. A. S., loc. cit.) "ÅsrâĂu the Lord" and the peculiar combination Arkkôn Yîr Tângri, the "archon earth-god", in which perhaps the word tângri is used for one of the powers of darkness (cf. J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 303, note 31).

In Christian Türkîsh usage is Tângri = God; Tângri-Oghîl = *Son of God" and Mîshkha Tângri = the God Messiah. In the Christian fragments published by F. W. K. Müller we also have the word Tâng-rîdâm, which we frequently find in Buddhîsh Türkîsh; it occurs twice in these Christian texts and seems here to mean simply "God". The Kuman usage gives nothing worthy of special remark.

As regards the earlier Muslim Türkîsh texts, the Arabic and Persîsh terms (Allâh, Khûdî) naturally begin to compete with the Türkîsh Tângri. In the KudîtuĂu Bîlik, so far as I am aware the Arabic name for God is of rare occurrence (practically only in Arabic quotations). The conception of God is however not exclusively confined by Tângri in this text but other Türkîsh words e.g. Bayât are used. The word Tângri occurs here also with the addition of ta'âlâ. In the Bîbar-
TARIM, local (Turkish) pronunciation Tarim, the principal river of modern Chinese Turkestan (length about 1,200 miles). It is probably the Old Kirghis river of Ptolemy (vi. 16). In the first (seventh) century the river is mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim Hsiian-Chuang (Hiouen-Thang, Mém. int., transl. Stan. Julien, ii. 220) under the name Si-to (Sanskrit Sita). In the fifth (sixth) century Mahmud Kâshgharî (i. 116) mentions the river Usmî Tarim "which flows out of the land of Islam into the land of the Uighurs and loses itself in the sand there". According to the same source (op. cit., p. 332), Usmî-Tarim was a place near Kûtas on the frontier of the land of the Uighurs along which the river flowed. The name Tarim then as now was apparently applied to the lower course of the river; in its upper course, often also down to its mouth, it is called after the capital of Chinese Turkistan, Yârkand Darya. The source of the Yârkand-Darya is the Raskem-Darya which lies in the mountains of Karakorum on the frontier of India. In the history of Timur (Ziarat-nâma, Calcutta 1857—1888, ii. 219), a place called Tarim is mentioned not far from Bâi and Kusân (Kuçâ). Tarim appears also in the Ta'rikh-i Rashidi of Muhammad Haider (transl. E. D. Russ, p. 67) as the name of a district, along with Türfên, Lob and Katak; the name of the river is not mentioned in these sources. According to the Ta'rikh-i Rashidi (op. cit., i. 11), the town of Lob-Katak (or the towns of Lob and Katak) was destroyed by a sandstorm in the viijth (sixth) century. As Sven Hedin (Through Asia, London 1898, p. 850) has ascertained, legends about the destroyed town of Katak ("Shahr-i Koteke or else Shah-i Katak") have survived to the present day, although no one has seen the ruins of this town. An arm of the Tarim in its lower course is called by K. N., Korgilow, Kâşgarî, Tâshkent 1903, p. 164. In the time of Mahmûd Kâshgharî, Islam had apparently not yet spread on the lower course of the Tarim. The people of town and desert of Lob on the other hand are described as Muhammadan by Marco Polo (Ch. 57).

The Yârkand-Darya leaves the mountains and enters the plain at the village of Karçun and receives on the left bank the Kâfî-Sul or Kâshghar-Darya, the Aşku or Ašqû-Darya, the Muzart or Şâh-şîr-Darya and the Kone-Darya, on the right the Tzînab, the Khutan-Darya and the Kerya-Darya. The right hand tributaries only reach the Tarim when they are flooded. Below the mouth of the Aşku the Tarim is about 400 yards wide; in this region it is divided into several arms; the principal arm, the Ugen-Darya, is 170 yards wide at Terek where Sven Hedin crossed it (Through Asia, p. 847). The separate arms are lost in the basin of the Lob or Lob-nor (Mongol: Lake Lob) in which the Çerçen-Darya also flows; the Su-liho also flows into it from the east. Lob (or Lop) according to Sven Hedin (Through Asia, p. 871), is now the name applied to the whole region from the mouth of the Ugen-Darya on the Tarim in the south to the village of Çarqû (south of Çerçen-Darya) in the south; as Pelliot (Journ. As., Ser. xi., vol. vii. 119) suggests, the same word Lop is reproduced at the beginning of our era in Chinese by Leou-lan. As the terms Lopnor and Tarim-gol (gol, Mongol: river; the latter on the map by J. Klaproth of 1839) show, the earliest accounts of the lake basin and lower course of the Tarim reached European scholars from Mongol (or Kalmük) sources. Quite recently the geographical and archaeological remains on the lower course of the Tarim have been investigated by numerous expeditions and many endeavours have been made to connect modern sites with references in the literary, especially Chinese, sources. According to Sir Aurel Stein's most recent explorations (1914; cf. Geogr. Journ., Aug. and Sept. 1916), there has probably been a large delta in the now almost completely dried up bed of the Lob, but never a large lake within historic times.

On account of its continental climate, the Tarim in spite of southern situation is covered with ice about three months of the year. On the lower course of the Tarim the natives (Lopî) catch fish in special boats. Sven Hedin, in his modern exploration of the region of Lob-Tarim in one such boat; there has never been any navigation in the proper sense on the Tarim. As in the time of Mahmûd Kâshgharî, the river was swallowaded up by the desert before it reached the bed of the lake; the fishing village of Kum-chapghan is described by Hedin (op. cit., p. 584) as "the entrance to the tomb of the Tarim".

Bibliography: A particularly full account of the most important sources is given in Kornilow, Kasgarîya, Tachkent 1903, p. 157 sqq. from his own researches and the narration of Przewalski, Hedin, Plevzow, Koslov etc. (W. BARTHOLOM.) TARIM, i. an old town and still one of the most important in northern Ha'dramût, on the left side of the main wâdi which traverses the whole of Ha'dramût and is called Wâdi Masle east of Shibâm or Wâdi Ha'dramût or simply Wâdi; others distinguish between Wâdi Ha'dramût, but are agreed on the position of the confluence of the two (cf. Sieter's map 60 in his Handatlas [Gotha 1905] and the Map of Ha'dramât [surveyed by Iman Sharif Khan Bahadur] in Th. Bent, Southern Arabia, London 1900, p. 70). The statements of the Arab geographers regarding Ha'dramût, especially the interior (already in part utilised by Kitter, Erdkunde, xii. [Berlin 1846], passim and brought together in a critical survey based on all texts, so far accessible, by M. de Goeje, Ha'dramant, Revue Coloniale Internationale, ii., 1886, p. 101 sqq.) are exceedingly scanty and do not give the impression of being based on the accounts of eye-witnesses. But contain the same matter as the isolated references in the travellers before Wrede and his own information about districts which he was not able himself to visit. The Arab geographers describe Shib am and Tarim as two (principal) towns in Ha'dramût, without further defining their situation, e. g. Yâkût, Ms'd'jam, ii. 284; iii. 247; i. 746; al-Iдрistî (see Joubert, Géographie d'Éditris [Paris 1836], p. 149 sq. and 53) and others (see below). Al-Hamdâni, Dîbrasr, p. 87, calls Tarim a large town (as he does the Tarfs northeast of Shibâm). Shibâm the great capital (p. 65). Of no importance are the more recent accounts of al-Nâbirî, p. 177 (al-Rawï with Taris etc.) or references in poets in al-Hamdâni, p. 182; al-Bakri, p. 107, 184 etc. K. Niebuhr, as early as 1763 (see his Beschreibung von Arabien [Copenhagen 1773], p. 286 sqq.) received in Sa'ûd and Maskat from Arabs stories of the existence of Tarim and Shibâm (on p. 286 the mention of "these two most prominent towns of Ha'dramût" is quoted from the Geographia...
The Täts of the Caucasus are at the present day entirely surrounded by Turkish and Daghestanian peoples. Their present habitats must always have been separated from the main body of Iranians. Their geographical distribution along the eastern chain of the Caucasus with an outpost to Darband seems to suggest the idea, which decided their settlement in these regions, namely the desire to reinforce the natural line of defence by Iranian colonies to meet invasions from the north. It would be tempting to recognise in the Täts remains of ancient colonies transplanted to Daghestan in the period when the Sasanians were fortifying Darband. According to Balâdî, p. 194, Anûshîrwan (531—579) had settled the region of Darband-Shābīrân [cf. šābīrān] with people from Sisakan (al-iyyājādīn). This last province was situated on the left bank of the Araxes (politically a district of Nakhschivan with the surrounding mountains) immediately north of Ādharbājidān. The people of Sisakan were Christians, but from the political and linguistic point of view held a special position in the kingdom of Armenia. In 571, they begged the Sasanian king to detach their province from Armenia and include it in Ādharbājidān; cf. Marquart, Eraniâr, p. 120—122, Hübschmann, Die alaramen. Ortsnamen, Indog. Forschungen, xvi., 1904, p. 263—266, 347—349. The late Darband-nāma. ed. Kazem-beg, Mém. présentés à l'Académie des Sciences par divers savants, vii., St. Petersburg 1851, p. 461, says Anûshîrwan people the new towns in the vicinity of Darband with people from Ādharbājidān and Fārs and the towns to the south of Darband (the region of Shāhâbân-Kūshâ; cf. the word Kūshâ) with certain (according to the Trāk and Fārs. According to the same source (p. 520) however, the fortresses around Darband were re-built under the Abbâsîd al-Mašrut (754—775) and on this occasion Arabs from Mawṣil and Syria were placed in them. Among the places fortified are especially mentioned Muṭtâš, Kamâkhi, etc. which at the present day are inhabited by Täts. It might be concluded from this that the presence of Täts at Muṭtâš etc. represents a migration later than the eighth century, but the text of the Darband-nâma, the original Persian of which has not yet been found (cf. Barthold, in Iran, i., Leningrad, 1926, p. 42—58) is not certain (according to Klapproth's version, three hundred families settled in Muṭtâš came from Tabasaran!). The historical sources at our disposal thus only reveal the ethnic complexity of the colonies established in Darband. On the other hand, Täti in its general characteristics is a modern dialect which (apart from rootaticism) does not show any special traces of antiquity such as might be expected if it had long been isolated. The question of the Täti Jewish dialect is only a subsidiary one, the Jews even if they had been in Daghestan before the coming of the Täts (cf. Miller, 1892, Introduction) may have adopted Täti in place of their old language (Arabic?).

As to the affinities of Täti the rootaticism of its dialects has analogies in the Iranian islands of Persian Ādharbājidān at the present day. For the region of Ardabil, we have examples from the xivth century (Ahmad Kizawt Ādharî, Zabān-i bâstân-i Ādharbâjidān, Tībrān, 1304 [1927]). The early borrowings made by Armenians from Iranian (Mar < Mâda; spared < špâşad) also suggest the existence at a very early date of this peculiarity among the Iranian neighbours of the Armenians (Marquart, Eraniâr, p. 174, note 6; Bartholomae, Indogerm. Forsch., Suppl. to vol. xix., 1906, p. 43, note 1). The other curious feature is the name of the town of Lāhidî inhabited by Täts (at the sources of the Gök-kâl) and perhaps mentioned in the Georgian Chronicle, Brosset, 1, p. 364, under the year 1120 (Lidatha or Laidjâ). The inhabitants themselves believe they came from Lāhidîn [q. v.]. The investigation conducted on the spot by V. F. Miller in 1928 has shown that the dialect of Lāhidî has certain special features. It is possible that some colonies of Täts were settled in Transcaucasia later than others and that the dialect of the principal group exercised a levelling influence on the neighbouring dialects (according to the Gulsîjâni-i Irâm, of Bâki-Khanov, Baku 1928, p. 14, the people of Miskindja in the district of Samur came from Astrâbâd in the time of Tahmär 1).


TATAR, written Tatar, Tatăr and Tatar, the name of a people the significance of which varies in different periods. Two Tatar groups of tribes, the "thirty Tatars" and the "nine Tatars", are mentioned in the Turkish Orkhon inscriptions of the eighth century A. D. As Thomsen (Inscriptions
de l’Orkhan, Helsingfors 1806, p. 140) supposes, even at this date the name was applied to the Mongols or a section of them but not to a Turkish people; according to Thomesen, these Tatars lived southwest of Baikal roughly as far as Kerulen. With the foundation of the empire of the Khitai [see KARA KIITAI] the Turks were driven out of modern Mongolia and Mongol tribes took their place. The district of Utikus, continually mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions as the dwelling-place of the Turks, lay, according to Mahmud Kaghshari (i. 123) in his time (second half of the vii th = xth century), in the land of the Tatars. That the language of the Tatars was different from Turkish was known to Mahmud Kaghshari (op. cit., i. 30). A number of Tatar clans had joined with Turkish peoples and moved farther westwards. In the anonymous Hudud al-Alam (cf. Zap., x. 121 sqq.) the Tatars are described as a part of the Thiughushuz [cf. GHUZZ] (cf. W. Barthold, Otlet o poradnike v Srednyuyu Assyju, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 34), by Farabi (op. cit., p. 62 sqq.) as part of the Khitan in their struggle against the Rukh (i.e. the three groups there were allowed to dwell) as Mudzud al-Tawurik (c. 520 = 1126), in the list of title-rulers (in Barthold, Turkistan, i. 26), is given a Tatar ruler Simiin buyuzy (or iliivi) diyayur, nowhere else mentioned. In the reports of the campaigns of Sultan Muhammad b. Takaš [see KHVARIZM-SHAN] against the Kipčak [q. v.] is mentioned a campaign by him in 615 (1218–1219) against Kudr Khan, son of the Tatar Yüsuf (Tobšači-i Nāsiri, trans. Revarty, 1881, i. 267).

In the accounts of the Mongol conquests of the vii th (xiiith) century the conquerors are everywhere (in China, in the Muslim world, in Russia and Western Europe) called Tatars (Chin. Ta-a); the same name is given in Ibn al-Athir (ed. Tornberg, xili. 175 sqq., 226 sqq.) to the predecessors of Cingiz Khan, the Naiman under Külüük [see KARA KITAI]; according to Ibn al-Athir (op. cit., p. 237), these were the “first Tatars” (al-Tatar al-ūlā). Rashid al-Din, who apparently knew nothing of the use and dissemination of the word Tatar before the Mongol period, speaks of the Tatars as if they were a separate people distinct from the Mongols, whose main centre had been the country on the Buir Nor (S. E. of Kerulen). After the conquests of Cingiz Khan many of the people subdued by him had, says Rashid al-Din, adopted the name “Moghul” (Mongol); the Tatars previously had been equally powerful; many peoples had been so called; therefore “in Khitai, Hindistān, Čin, Mācín, among the Kirghiz, in Kālār (Poland), Bāškīrd (Hungary), in the steppes (dachti) of Kipčak, in the northern lands among the Beduins, in Syria, Egypt and in the Maghrib, all the Turkish peoples are to this day called Tātar” (text in Trud. Vost. Otd. Arkh. Obyчёт., vii. 64).

The peoples of Mongol origin and language had apparently always called themselves Tatar. After the time of Cingiz Khan, this word was commonly supplanted in Mongolia and Central Asia by the word “Khitai” (in the Orkhon inscriptions Moghal or Moghil and in the every day language of the descendants of the Mongols in Afghānistān, who have kept their language to the present day, Moghol), officially introduced by Cingiz Khan. In the most western parts of the Mongol empire, the word Mongol never became predominant, although it was also introduced there officially, as we know from European travellers (John of Plano Carpi and William of Rubruck; Hakl. Soc., 1905, Index s.v. Mongol and Tartar). The people of the kingdom of the Golden Horde [see KUṬAṬ KIITAI and BEKKE] and of the later minor kingdoms in the same region are always called “Tatar”. As the many documents preserved in the Public Library in Leningrad show, the Turkish speaking peoples of the Crimea were not only called “Tatar” by the Ottomans (as by the Russians) but also called themselves Tatars.

A Mongol force had been transferred to Asia Minor at the time of the conquest. Their descendants (who no doubt became turkicised) were called “Black Tatars” (Kara Tatar); at the time of Timur’s campaign they were leading a nomadic life in the country between Amasia [q. v.] and Kaisariya [q. v.]; they numbered 30–40,000 families (Zafar-nāma, 1st ed., Calcutta 1888, ii. p. 502 sqq.). Timur had these “Tatars” deported to Central Asia, according to Ibn ‘Arabshāh (ed. Mangier, ii. 338), on the advice of Sultan Bāyazīd [q. v.] were allowed to dwell in Kaghshari on an island (which now no longer exists) in Lake Issik-Kul [q. v.] and in Khiwaruzm; a section of them succeeded in escaping to the lands of the Golden Horde. After Timur’s death, the Black Tatars returned to Asia Minor; in 1419 they (or a part of them) were deported to the Balkans and settled west of Philippopolis; the town of Tatar-Pazardjik takes its name from them (J. von Hammer, GOK, Pesth 1834, i. 292).

Later in Russia and in Western Europe we frequently find the name Tatars applied to all the Turkish peoples with the exception of the Ottomans; this use of the word is still found in Radloff, Aus Sibirien, Leipzig 1884, passim. After the example of the Chinese, the name has been extended to the Mongols also and especially to the Manchus (cf. the “Tatar town” in Peking). As the name of a particular people, the word Tatars is used only for the Turkish speaking people of the Volga basin from Kazan to Astrakhan, the Crimea, and a part of Siberia; in the printed list (episkef) of the year 1927 of the peoples of the Union of Soviets, the Tatars in the Crimea, the Tatars of the Volga, the Tatars of Kasimov [q. v.] and the Tatars of Tobolisk are therefore given as separate peoples, in addition to the Tatars of White Russia whose ancestors were deported to Poland as prisoners from the Crimea. They have adopted the language of the White Russians but have remained faithful to Islam. The name “Tatar” is now rejected by the people of the Crimea. The Turkish speaking people of Astrakhan according to the most recent investigation belong to the Nogai stock. In the central course of the Volga also the “Tatars” are usually given this name by their Christian fellow-countrymen, the “Kryşhen” (from the Russian kreşteny “baptised”) (Radloff, Wörterbuch, iii. 101 sqq.). They prefer to call themselves “Muslims” rather than “Tatars” which was more fitting their heathen ancestors, just as the Ottomans have long preferred not to be called “Turks”. Even in the last year before the Revolution when the principle of nationality had already come to the front it was disputed whether they should be called “Turks” or “Tatars” (M. L., i., 1912, p. 270 sqq.); the name “Tatars” has now prevailed; since 1920 there has existed an autonomous Tatar Socialist Soviet Republic with capital
Kazan [q. v.] and a population of 2,780,000 of whom rather less than half (1,306,292) are Tatars. Cf. the ethnographical survey (elék) by Prof. D. Zlatarev in the book of travels Poznyky, 1926, p. 99 sqq. (the figures are given on p. 123 and 126).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(W. Barthold)

TAṬİL a technical term used in dogmatics meaning the divesting of the conception of God of all attributes; see the article TAṢṢĪH."}

TAWAHDUDD, the heroine of a story which is preserved in the 1001 Nights as well as in an independent form. Tawaddud (as a personal name not found elsewhere in Arabic literature—however frequent it is as a nomen verbi—is of similar formation to Tamanî, Tadjaami and similar women’s names) is the slave of a merchant who has fallen into poverty and, following her advice, offers her for sale to the caliph Harûn to free him from his difficulties. Harûn declares himself ready to pay the high price demanded on condition she shows by an examination that she possesses all the knowledge she claims. In the tests made by a number of learned men, including Ibrâhîm b. Saiyâr al-Naẓâm, Tawaddud answers all the questions put to her in the field of theological knowledge, astronomy, medicine and philosophy, solves all the riddles put to her and proves herself an expert in chess, backgammon and playing the lute; finally she in her turn puts questions to her examiners which they cannot answer and in this way she puts even the proud Naẓâm to shame. When the caliph then asks her to beg a boon of him, she asks to be given back to her former master, which the caliph does and gives her a present besides, and makes her master one of his boon companions.

For the date of the story the name of al-Naẓâm (d. 1231 = 835–46) preserved in all versions even the Şi‘a and Christian forms (see below), gives a terminus post quem, while the oldest Spanish version going back probably to the 13th century gives a lower limit; but we shall hardly have to go beyond the 11th or 12th century. Several manuscripts which contain the story as an independent story give the name of the narrator but it is not always the same and its identity has so far not been established. The essential features for him are the questions and answers which take up most of the space; the story of Tawaddud only forms the framework which he fills out with these. Several motives, such as the magnanimity of the purchaser, are found in other stories of the Arabian Nights and outside this collection also; the didactic purpose however and the form in which the learned matter is conveyed, ally the story to the books of questions found among the Persîs, in the Christian east and European middle ages and in Arabic literature also. The Arabic books of questions are sometimes like the Kitâb al-Tarîb wa ‘l-Tadwîr of Dâhîz intelligible only to the learned, sometimes for popular instruction like the questions of ‘Abd Allâh b. Sa‘în, which have passed into other Muslim literatures. Tawaddud belongs to the latter group although the theological part in the didactic part of the story is by no means so predominant as in the questions of ‘Abd Allâh. A Şî‘a version of Tawaddud is found in the Ḥasanîya of Abu ‘l-Futuwwa popular in Persia in Malcolm’s time.

A Christian version is the Spanish Historia della donzella Thedor, of which we still possess an older form free from the Christian insertions of the later. The Historia della donzella Thedor—the manuscript in Madrid of the Hîbîyat al-Lûriya Thîdar already has this corruption of the name—was repeatedly reprinted as a chap-book down to the nineties of the last century, and in the Portuguese translation down to the first decade of the twentieth.


TAWAÎF (Ar.) from dâfa with bi of place) encircling; in the language of ritual the running round or circumambulation of a sacred object, a stone, altar, etc. There are traces of the rite having existed among the Israelites, cf. Lev. xxv. 19 (xvrîn); the ceremony of the feast of booths in the time of the Second Temple, where the altar is circumambulated once on the first six days and seven times on the seventh. The rite however was also found among Persians, Indians, Buddhists, Romans and others and is therefore very ancient. It played a very important part in the religious ceremonial of the ancient Arabs. We find the synonymous dawâr (from dâra) also used. Thus Imru ‘l-Kais, Mu‘allaqa, 63, compares the wild cows with young women in long trailing robes, who perform the circumambulation (dawâr), a circumambulated idol like dawâr in ‘Antara 10, 2, if dîwâr is not to be read here). In Mecca the Ka‘ba which enclosed the Black Stone sacred from very ancient times used to be circumambulated and Muhammad adopted this old custom when he established the rites of his religion and centred them round the Ka‘ba. Then, in the year 8, he made his victorious entry into his native town, i.e. he said by Ibn Hîshâm, p. 520 and Tâbarî, i. 1642 to have performed the tawâf riding on his camel, touching with his crooked staff the rûkhn (the eastern corner of the Ka‘ba where the stone was). This was however something exceptional and according to Ibn Hîshâm, it was only shortly before his death at the “farewell pilgrimage" that he laid down the authoritative rules for the circumambulation. It may however be assumed with certainty that he observed ancient traditional forms ("handed down from Abraham": cf. Ibn Hîshâm, p. 51 sq, so that we can deduce from Muslim practice what the ancient pagan custom was; one feature of the latter was that the circumambulation had to be performed seven times in succession (cf. above on the feast of booths) the three first at a greater speed, beginning at the black stone and ending there and the course keeping the Ka‘ba on the right; one should make a special effort to kiss the stone or at least touch it. On the contrary, if Wellhausen is correct, it was an innovation that the tawâf which previously took place round the ūmara [q. v.] was inserted by Muhammad in the great hâdîq when the pilgrims visited Mecca. This suggestion is however disputed, cf. Hâdîq, i., p. 199 sq where Sûra iii. 91 is quoted against it, but the expression hâdîq al-bât is hardly decisive,
not much is known. "Omar seems to have been the more active of the two. In 1477 he fought on the Isonzo against the Venetians (cf. J. von Hammer, G. O. R., ii. 151), next year defeated the Albanians (ibid., ii. 157) and was still alive in 1484, as his will dated Muḥarram 889 (February 1484), shows (cf. E. G. Pharmakidès, op. cit., p. 287—303 or 307—310). "Omar Beg had two sons, one of whom, called Ḥasan Beg, is known from his will written in Ṣawwāl 937 (May 1531; cf. Pharmakidès, p. 310 sqq.), while the other, Idrīs Beg, bears a name in his day as a poet and excellent translator of Hāfiẓ's Khāreq an-niwārid in and Laila an-nimrān into Turkish (cf. Seht, Tektürk, p. 36 sq.). The family of Turakhaṇ-oghlius, which was established around Larisa and owned extensive estates until quite modern times, later played no important part in history. A certain Fāqīr Pasha, recorded as a late descendant of Turakhaṇ Beg, by his extortions as governor of Rūm-eli made his name hated; he was beheaded in the court of the Serai in Stamul at the age of 70 in March 1643 (cf. J. von Hammer, G.O.R., p. 322 from Na'mā, and Zinkeisen, G.O.R., iv. 535). J. Ph. Fallmayer in 1842 saw "at the chief mosque [of Larisa] a biography of Turchan-Beg preserved there" (cf. Fragmenta aus dem Orient, 1877, p. 381 sqq.) but this seems to have since disappeared (like the MS. biography of the Ewenros-oghlius [q.v.] mentioned by Beaujour, Tablau du commerce de la Grice, i. 117). The genealogical table on p. 877 gives a conspectus of the descendants of Pasha Yigit Beg, the real founder of this Ottoman noble family.

Bibliography: D. Uruquhart, Spirit of the East, London 1838, vol. i.; cf. the German transl. by F. G. Buck, Stuttgart and Tubingen 1839, i. 226 sqq., from an Arabic biography of T. and his family preserved in the public library at Tyrnacou in Thessaly. (F. Bainger) Tūrān (or Tawarān), the old name of a district in Balūstān. According to Tabari, i. 820, the kings of Tūrān and Makrān (Makriān) submitted to the Sūnnaic Ardashir (224—241). The Poikuli inscription only mentions the Makrān-ḡāh. Hersfeld, Poikuli, p. 38, thinks that these princes at first owned the suzerainty of the Sakas and their submission to Ardashir was the result of the conquest of Sakastān (= Sīstān) by this monarch. Balūstān does not mention al-Tūrān. According to one of his sources, Ḥadīddarī [q.v.] appointed Saʿīd b. Aslam to Mūrān and "[all] that frontier". Ṣ daḥ, p. 171, and Ibn Ḥawkal, p. 226, among the inhabited places in Tūrān mention Muḥā (T., Kārak, Sūrā (Ṣīstān) and Kūzār (or Kūzār). Ibn Ḥawkal, p. 235, says that Tūrān is a valley with a fortified town (kābba) also called al-Tūrān and in its centre is a fortress (bihār) commanded by an ignorant Baṣrān. Ibn Ḥawkal, p. 233—235, mentions Kūzār separately from the kābba of the same name. Kūzār was the town (commercial) of Tūrān possessing "a district and several towns". A certain Muḥīr (or Muʿta b. Ahmād) had seized Kūzār and only recognised the direct authority of the Aḥbāsid caliph.

The statements in Idrīs, i. 166, 177, confuse the situation, for he gives the name al-Tūrāna to the station in Makrān which Ibn Khurdaṭābībī, p. 55, calls al-Tābārān [ten farsakkhs S.E. of Fahraḍ], on the river which is now called Sarbāz and flows into the sea near Gwatar]; but also associates Kūzdār and Kīkānān (towns in the district of Tūrān?) with this Tūbarān. On the other hand, he places Tūrān 4 days' journey from Kūzdār, in the direction of Mastūndji, i.e. to the north. As the site of Kūzdār [q.v.] is known (85 miles S. of Kālāt at a height of 4,050 feet: cf. the article BALŪSTĀN), Tūrān (the town) must be located at Kālāt.

The town of Kānūdābīl, five farsakkhs (more accurately 5 marakhs) from Kūzdār, is outside of Tūrān and is the capital of the district of the Kūzās (Balūstān, p. 436: Zēz al-Daliba). Kānūdābīl, lying in the middle of a region inhabited by the Gandāwa (75 English miles N.E. of Khozdār, to the north of the Indus, at a height of 314 feet above sea-level).

The position of Kīkānān, the residence of the already mentioned Muʿta b. Ahmād (chief of Tūrān according to Ṣ daḥ, or of Kūzdār, according to Ibn Ḥawkal), is unknown. Marquart, op. cit., p. 192, 275—276, connects Kīkānān with Kīkān (cf. Balūstān, p. 432) and seeks it at Kālāt. In this case, Kīkānān = the kābba al-Tūrān. The land between Kīkānān and Kānūdābīl, inhabited by Budhas and possessing vines, bore the name of its chief Ayl (or Uīl [i]).

Yākūl, iii. 557, reckons Tūrān (the kābba of which is Kūzdār and which has several rustād) among the nāḥiyā of Sind. He also mentions a nāḥiyā of Tūrān in Mādhīn and a village of Tūrān belonging to Harāt. The Arabs write Tūrān with ṭ which may represent some local aspiration of t. In principle there is nothing to object to in the connection of Tūrān with Tūrān but it would be unwise to go beyond stating the similarity of the names. The connection is still weaker if we connect Tūrān with Tūbarān and Tābārān.

Bibliography: Tomaschev, Zur hist. Topogr. Persiens, i. 56, thinks the name Tūrān may come from the Iranian term Tūra, which means "enemy, non-Iranian countries"; Marquart, Erzählen, p. 31—33, 187, 190; Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 332; Hüsing, Vorherrschaften in Iran, Mitt. d. Anthrop. Gesell. Wien, xxxvi. 1916, p. 200, seeks the real Tūrān not in Turkestān but in Tūrān of Kūzdār (inhabited by the ancestors of the Braḥū of our day). (V. Mīnorský)

Tūrān, an Iranian term applied to the country to the north-east of Iran. The form of the name is not earlier than the Middle Persian period. The suffix -ān is used to form both patronymics (Pāpākān) and the names of countries (Gēlān, Dālamān) (cf. Grundr. d. iran. Phil., iil., p. 176; Salemann, ibid., iil., p. 280 expresses doubts as to whether -ān is from the genitive plural -ānā). Three questions are raised by the name Tūrān: 1. its origin, 2. its later acceptance, which identifies Tīra with "the land of the Turks", 3. its modern geographical, linguistic and political applications.

The Tūra. In the Iranian sphere, the element Tūr of Tūrān has analogies in the Avestan Tūra (Tūra). In the parts preserved of the Avesta, we have 1. Tūra, the father of two pious individuals, who bear the Iranian names of Arzāhawant and Frāzā but of whom nothing more is known (Yāzād, xii. 113—123); 2. the people called Tūra or Tūra, probably nomads (Yāzād, xvii. 55; ūr-uppā having swift steeds). [The adjective from Tūra, with epenthesis, is ūrīyā.]
The Tüyans are several times represented as enemies of the Iranians and of the true religion (cf. Yaqti, xvi. 55 where they pursue Aššu waquhi). A subdivision (f) of the Tüyans is called Dzau (Yaqti, xvi. 55–56), which may be connected with the Sanskrit daka "demons." A particularly hateful figure is that of the "Türyan brigand" Frāṣaṣya (="Afrāsiyāb"), whose fruitless attempts to seize the royal power (zawarana) are related at length in Yaqti, xix. 56–64. But the same Yaqti, xix. 93, admits that the zawarana had once been in the possession of Frāṣaṣya, when he played the part of defender of Iran against the tyrant Zainigav. The hostility to Frāṣaṣya might therefore have political roots.

Quite a number of passages reveal that there were pious people among the Türa. The family of the Türyan Frāṣya is particularly praised in a very early passage in the Gāthas (Yasna, xlvi. 12). The passage in Yaqti, xiii. 143 is very well known: "we sacrifice to the frawaṣa of the pious men and the pious women of the Aryan (Iranian), Türyan, Sairimyan, Sāinyan and Dālīyan lands". An indirect indication of the abode of the Türa is given in Yaqti, v. 57, where the descendants of "Vaṣeka, lieutenant of Frāṣaṣya (zāhā-nāma, ed. Vullers, i. 248, 264; Wässe), are located at the pass of Xāṯrā-sāna, situated "very high" in Kanha (=Bukhāra?; cf. Marquart, Komanen, p. 196; in Chinese: Xiang = Samarqand). On the other hand, the name of the casan Tur, which the Armenian translator of Tolemy mentions in Khisravīz (ed. Soukry, § 344; cf. below), is very significant.

Several hypotheses have been put forward regarding the ethnic character of the Türa. Geiger, Ostir. Kultur, p. 194, thought that this term referred to all the peoples of the steppes without distinction of race ("ein Kollectivbegriff...", der keine ethnographische Trennung bezeichnete, sondern die Steppenvölker der Ebenen vom Kaspiise bis an den Sūr und darüber hinaus umfasste"). Geiger thought it possible that there were Tatar elements among the Türa ("oberste einer tatarischen Urbevölkerung"?). It should however be noted that Geiger's attempt (p. 198) to find the Huns among the Türa is now rejected (hun, "son, descendant"; Bartholomae, Altir. Wörterb., col. 1831).

The term ḏānu (cf. above) may also have a non-ethnic significance and mean the non-Mandaean Tūra ("demons") [Christensen (1938) has revived Geiger's thesis; he supposes that Tūra was "originally the designation of the nomad peoples, whether they were of Iranian race or not?").

On the other hand, Blochet, in his article "Le nom des Turcs dans l'Avesta" supports the popular etymology Tūra = Turk and seeks to explain the names of the Türyan Dānu, Kara Asabana and Vara Asabana, by the Turkish words kara "black" and gōr (?) "clever": "the name Turk, or at least the root from which it comes [sic!], was in existence at a date long before the sixth century". In this connection it may be recalled that whatever may be the etymology of the term may be the etymology of the term may be zābhār- (cf. drūtarkh, "force", power"; F. W. K. Müller, Utgurica, i. 10; türkīm, "family"; Kāshgārī, i. 368), the name Tūra is readily explained in Iranian as "courageous", "brave"; cf. tür in Persian and in Kurdish and the significant allusion of Firdawsī to the character of Tūr, son of Faridin. It is true that the etymology of Kara and Vara is still obscure and that, according to Firdawsī, a member of the Vēsa family bears the name of Karūkhīn (?) (ed. Vullers, i. 261), but alongside these names one could place other Türyan names of clearly Iranian appearance, including that of the third companion of Kara and of Vara, Dūrākāštā "whose wish goes far". (This argument would lose its value if we could prove that the princes of Tūra were of foreign origin, but at the same time, one would lose all means of identifying the people).

The most elaborate hypothesis concerning the Tūra is that of Marquart, Erānšahr, p. 155–157. According to him, the celebrated ancestral home of the Iranians Aryanem waš-fā was in Khisravīz. The legendary wars of Iran and Tūran reflect the struggles between the settled Iranians (who, proud of their superior culture, had monopolized the name ahrvanea) with the nomad Massagetai "fish-eaters" (cf. Avesta masya "fish" and the Scythian plural suffix -ta). It is these Scythian Massagetai, living at first to the east of the Oxus and the sea of Aral, who must have taken the name of Tūra. The district of Tūr which the Armenian translator of Tolemy (Annais of Shirak?) mentions in Khisravīz must be a memory of the Tūra people. The connection of the district of Tūr with the Bactrian satrapy of Tavāpōta (Strabo, xi. 517) has still to be settled (cf. Oberhummer, op. cit., p. 194, 203). The later migrations of peoples have completely changed the ethnical map of Asia and gradually the term Tūra was transferred to the new enemies of the Iranians, the Sacaraucae, the Tokharians, the Yüe-chi, the Kūshāns, the Khiōnites, the Hephthalites and the Turks.

The Sanskrit translation of the Avesta renders Tūra by Turošak. This last word seems usually to refer to the Turks, but the Sanskrit translation is very late (Grundr. d. iran. Phil., ii, p. 50), its interpretation of ethnical terms has no value.

The influence of the zābhāh-nāma. The connexion between the Türk and the Tūra was found quite late (cf. Spiegel, Eranišche Alterthumskunde, 1871, i. 553 and especially Geiger, op. cit., 1822, p. 193). The Middle Persian sources which might retain traces of the evolution of Tūra from Tūra have had no direct influence on the formation of the current connotation of Türk. We can therefore say that the principal source of oriental and European views on this subject has been the zābhāh-nāma. The parallel Persian and Arabic sources, also based on the Middle Persian Khisravīz, have served only as a supplement to Firdawsī's poem.

Türān is mentioned in the chapter of the zābhāh-nāma relating to the tripartition of the world by Faridun (Thrašaṭona, Frēdisnā), the last universal monarch (ruler of the clime Xvanrās); cf. Macan's edition p. 58; Mohil, i. 138; Vullers, i. 77–78.

Türān and its eponym. Yaqti, xii. 143 (cf. above), which is very early, reflects the idea that the world is made up of five nations. On the other hand the name of the Pahlavi book of the Tripartite world, we know that an Avestan book now lost, spoke of the tripartition of the world among the sons of Faridun (Thrašaṭona, Frēdisnā); Sarm, Tūč and Frēč (Pahlavi forms). We have evidently a case of two sets of traditions being amalgamated by giving the ancient peoples Iranian eponyms. But as the changes had taken place in the world as known to the Iranians, the two eldest sons of Faridun had to be given, one in the west the
other in the east, apanages in conformity with the political divisions of the period (Sassanian). The west was thus identified with Rûm (Byzantine empire) and the east with the Turks, neighbours of the Persians since the defeat of the Hephthalites under Khusrav I (ca. 557).

The ancient legend of the tripartition of the world among the sons of Thraetaona symbolised the relationship of the ancient peoples of whom they were the eponyms. In the time of Firdawsi, the legend was totally deprived of ethnical foundation and the contradictions have to be concealed by plain and plain words. In the Şahâ-nâma, Faridun gives his name the sons of Salm (Tur and Iradj only after subjecting them to a test to reveal their characters. The eldest, who has escaped the danger without scathe (salâmat) receives the land in the west (Rûm va-xawar) with the title Xâwar-khûdây. To the dashing second son (tir = courageous) is given Turân and he becomes Turânshâh, or Shâh-i Cîn, "lord of the Turks and Chinese" (Türk wa-Cîn; cf. ed. Vullers, reign of Faridun, verses 460 and 295). The youngest, as brave as he is prudent, receives Irân and the plain of the heroes" (or perhaps of the Kurds: cf. ibid., verses 291, 300 and 321) with the title Irân-khûdây.

In the Arabic writers (cf. Tabarî, i. 226) the name of the eldest son still has the form Šarm < Sairina. But as the Pahlavi alphabet does not distinguish r and l, Firdawsi (as well as the Muqânât al-Tawârîkh) preferred the variant Salm which lent itself to a play on the Arabic root s-l-m. (Modi's attempt: Avicin: Papers, Bombay 1905, p. 244, and Blochet's: Rev. de l'I. Chrétien, 1925, xxv, p. 431, to connect Sairina directly with Rome (S-Rim, cf. Armen. h-Rom) is wild in every respect. That connection of Salm with every is still very slight is evident from the fact that the two brothers Salm and Turûq fight east of the Caspian Sea (Thâlîbî moves the scene of war to Adharbâyijân) and hold there jointly a naval stronghold Alašân-dîk (Dihistanên Şûr, on the Cape of Şan-i-ku? on which see Barthold, K. isirîi oregašiš step a Turkestanu, St. Petersburg 1914, p. 33). The name of the Aâsên (ancestors of the modern Lâstên and descendants of the Sauromeans = Sairina?) in these regions can relate only to a period about the first century n.c., when the Iranians still ruled around the Caspian (Marquart, Konanan, p. 108).

The name Tur (Firdawsi and Muqânât al-Tawârîkh) appears in the Dinkart, viii. 13 as Tûč and this form predominates in the Arabic sources: Ibn Khûrdâḏbih, p. 15: Tûdî or Tûs; Dinawari, p. 11 (the sons of Nimûḏ: Irâd, Salm and Tûs); Tabarî, i. 226; Fihrist, p. 12; Maṣûḏi, Murâdh, ii. 108; Birûn, al-Aṯâr al-bûyya, p. 102; Thâlûbî, ed. Zöllner, p. 41 (Tûş, Tur). In any case the form Tûr chosen by Firdawsi to explain Tûrân as the apene of the bearer of the name differs from the forms found in the Pahlavi and Arabic sources. According to Marquart, Beiträge, Z.D.M.G., 1895, p. 664—7, Tûc < Tauri (from Tûra); according to Christensen, Tûc is from Tur + e = of Tûrûn origin.*

Tûrân as a geographical term. The term Tûrân, formed from the name of the people Tûra, which is derived from that of its eponym Tûr (Tur), and ultimately applied to the country of the Turks, ought to be found in the Sasanian Khwây-nâmâ, the source used by the Arab historians and by Firdawsi. It is true that the Bundâlašâh, xii. 13, 39, etc., uses only the term Turkestan (while Salmân, "land of Salm" ibid. xx. 12, there designates the country from which the Tugra comes) but we find Tûrân in the Dinkart viii, and in the fragments from Turfan (F. W. K. Müller, ii. 87).

For Firdawsi, Turân, land of the Turks and of the Chinese, is separated from Iran by the Ouxus (Şahânâma, ed. Vullers, reign of Faridun, verses 295, 309, 322, 456, 459, 547, 726, reign of Nawddar verse 232; ed. Mohl, v. 680, reign of Bahrân Gûr). On the other hand in the account of the defeat of Arfaśiyb, the beginning of his domains seems to be extended to "Kibâqâ". Marquart, Konanan, p. 110, from the manuscripts, emends this name to Koškâr (koški) and identifies it with the encampment of the Karluh (q.v.) 5 farsakhs beyond Tarâz (q.v.); cf. Ibn Khûrâshibhî, p. 24: Kûry bûs. In the same way the capital of Arfaśiyb, Kang-dîr, is located by Firdawsi somewhere near China, without any connection with the country of Kang (Bukhâra) (ed. Vullers, verse 138); cf. Bartholomae, col. 437; Marquart, Konanan, p. 109). These details may record the early stages in the western movements of the Turks. As to the Chinese, subjects of the kings of Turân, Firdawsi may have substituted their name for that of the old Avestan people Śânavar, already assimilated to the Chinese in the Bundâlašâh (Darmesteter, Le Zend Avesta, ii. 554).

The Muslim writers, Arab, Persian and Turkish, have not been logical in the use of the term Turân. But since for the Arab geographers, the land of the Turks began only to the east of the Sir Dârâ and did not include Transoxiana (cf. Barthold, Turkestân, Gîbî Mem. Ser., p. 64), it seems that there was a tendency to identify Turân with Transoxiana, i.e. with the lands between the Amû-Đâr and the Sir Dârâ. According to Khâzîzimı, MasûĎal al-Ulûm, p. 114, the Persians call the land beside the Ouxus, Marz-Turân. For Yâkût, i. 892, Turân is the country of Mâ warâ al-Nahr (Transoxiana); after the tripartition of the world by Afûrân, the Turks call the land of the Turâns and their king Tûdî (Yâkût also mentions a village of Turân near Harrân). Very curious is the archaising reference in Dimîškî, Cosmographie (ca. 1320), ed. St. Petersburg, p. 114, according to which the Sayhûn (Sir-Dârâ) forms the frontier between Transoxiana, i.e. the land of the Hayâtîla called Tûlân (= Turân) and the land of Turkestan which is called Farghâna (on Fâhî = Transoxiana, cf. also Erdnãhr, p. 307). Much more vague is the use of the term in the MasûĎal al-Âsâr (xivth century) where the Volga is called Nahr-Turân and the Caspian Tâbûrân (the former Khâns of Kipâş: Marquart, Konanan, p. 138) are located at Ark-tagh (?), identified by Quatemère and Marquart with the Ural Mountains.

In the Żafar-nâmâ (xvth century), Turân is only used for poetical comparisons (i. 34, 624: "the heroes of Turân in Iran"). Abu l-Ġazzâ (xvith century) sometimes uses it in a mythological term (ed. Desmaisons, p. 2, 129, 140), sometimes identifies it with western Siberia (p. 177), sometimes seems vaguely to regard the lands of Muhammâd Khwârizmî as situated between Iran and Turân (Iranird ošt, p. 96).

The term Turân became known in Europe from Herbelot’s Bibliothèque Orientale, Paris 1697,
mar of this group, has, after some hesitation, solidly established the relationship of Turkish with Mongol and their connection with Tunguz is also admitted. On the other hand, the connection of Altaic with Finno-Ugrian and Samoyed still lacks decisive proof. As to the term Turanian, it has been completely banished from modern linguistics. Cf. Denny, *Langues europeennes. Les langues du Monde*, Paris 1924; Poppe, *La parenté des langues altaiques. Histoire et état actuel de la question* (in Russian), Bâkû 1926; Sauvageot, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des langues ouralo-altaiques*, Paris 1929.

Pan-Turanianism. This political term is used on the one hand as synonymous with the Pan-Turkish movement (Türk-düşüklük “Turkism”) and on the other is applied to something much more vague, the tendency to a rapprochement among the “Turanian peoples”.

In the latter meaning, it has been particularly employed in Hungary where the first appearance of the term Tûran, in the ideal sense of the distant fatherland, dates from 1839 (according to Count Teleki: “eine gewisse Schwärmerei für Stammland und Stammverwandte”). The review *Turan* founded at Budapest during the World War by the *Turánische Gesellschaft*, to judge from the Bulgarian and Turkish contributions, was intended to study the history and civilisation “of the peoples who are related to us” (in Turkish: *bism-le kara-het olan milletler*). The editor however (1918, No. 1, p. 5) took up quite a distinct attitude in the following pronouncement: “*our Turan is geographical; it is neither the Tûran of Max Müller, the subject of lively controversy, nor the Tûran of political aspirations*”. Count Teleki and Prof. Cholnoky (*Turan*, ein Landschaftsbegriff, *ibid.*, No. 1, p. 85) conceived this region as lying between the following boundaries: the Caspian Sea, the Iranian plateau, the mountains at the sources of the Sir-Darâ and the Irîsh and the plateau of Akmolinsk. Setting aside the value of this region, the uniformity of this geographical milieu and on the influence it has exerted upon the peoples who have lived there, it must be recognised that from the point of view of geographical terminology (cf. above) such a use of the word Tûran is quite new and personal. Broadly speaking, this Tûran is a useless term substituted for Turkestan, which has at least the merit of being a definite conception.

In Russia also we can find tendencies parallel to those of the Hungarian “Turranian”. The group called *Eurasian* has interested itself in geo-politics and the cultural influence of the East in the so-called “Siberian” (cf. I. R., *L’héritage de Çingis-khan* (in Russian), Berlin 1925; Prince N. Troubetskoi, *Sur l’élement touniani de la culture russe* (in Russian), Paris 1927. Much clearer in principle are the tendencies of the Pan-Turanian movement comprised in the narrower sense of “Pan-Turkish” but in the absence of a complete study of this cultural and political movement we can only give a summary account of its stages of development and programme. The Ottoman empire at the period of its greatest expansion was quite without any tendencies not to Turkism. The highest offices were filled by non-Turks, whose conversion to Islam was often of recent date. The levies of Christian children [cf. *negovitchi*] provided the state with the most capable civil and military officers (cf. Lybyer, *The Govern-

**The Encyclopaedia of Islam, IV.**
ment ... of Suleiman the Magnificent, Cambridge Mass. 1913, p. 53—56). The theory of the sultanlık excluded the possibility of preferring the Turkish elements to the other Muslim subjects of the empire. Even in the sixteenth century the word Türk had in the Ottoman empire the definite meaning of "pleasant, rustic, yokel" (cf. the popular proverbs). In this connection the poem by Mehemd Emin Bey, written during the war with Greece in 1897, marks the date of the complete change of meaning of the word: Ben bir türk-üm, dinim djinism uludür: "I am a Turk, my religion and my race are exalted ones".

Several factors have determined the development of the "Turkist" movement, sometimes called Türanian.

a. The formation in the sixteenth century of numerous national movements (Greek, German, Italian, Slav, Armenian, Arah) several of which were directed against the Ottoman empire.

b. The reverses suffered by the Ottoman empire, which deprived it of its possessions in the Balkans, in Africa and finally in Asia also (Syria, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Mesopotamia). With each diminution of Ottoman territory the Turkish element of Anatolia gained in importance, not only as regards numerical proportion but also from the point of view of the only sure and stable basis upon which the state could be established.

c. The progress made by Turcology, which has drawn up an inventory of the Turkish peoples, established the affinity of their languages and thrown light upon the early history of the Turks. [More direct has been the influence of the romantic work by L. Cahun, Introduction à l'Histoire de l'Asie, Paris 1896 (Turkish adaptation by Nedjib Aşım). Among the earlier works which have exerted an influence on these lines Ziya Gök Alp mentions of Guignes, Histoire générale des Turcs, des Mongols et des Huns, Paris 1756—1758 and Lumley Davids, Turkish Grammar, London 1832 and 1836. Here also we should mention the sketches of national movements published by the R. M. M. and the work of R. Hartmann tending to establish a bond of union among Turkish peoples].

d. The formation in Russia of a Muslim intelligence, primarily Turco-Tatar, and the impetus given to the Turkish press in Russia by the events of 1905. The emigrants from Russia, like Ali Husân-zâde (Bâkû), Yusuf Ak-çura (Kazan) and Ahmed Ağa-oghlu (Karabâgh) have been the driving forces in the movement and even had to overcome considerable opposition emanating from the Turks of Turkey.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, three political theses were to the front in Turkey: Pan-Islamism, Ottomanism and Pan-Turkism. An open discussion of these was instituted (1902—1903) in the journal Türk published in Cairo. The Pan-Turkish point of view was championed by Yusuf Ak-çura-oghlu whose article Úc türs siyaset (reprinted at Stamboul in 1927) has played an important part in the elaboration of the programme. Ak-çura criticised Ottomanism as tending to diminish the privileges of the Turks and contrary to Islam which recognises equal rights for all believers. On the other hand, Pan-Islamism would exacerbate the non-Muslims and meet resistance from certain European powers. The author then declared for Pan-Turkism, thinking it would overcome the greatest obstacle, represented by Russia, with the help of other governments (R. M. M., xxii., p. 179—221).

In the same journal Türk Ak-çura's thesis was criticised by the liberal 'Ali Kemâl, in the name of Ottomanism, and by Ahmed Ferid on grounds of possibility, for pan-Islamism seemed to him unrealisable and pan-Turkism so far non-existent.

In the early days of the revolution of July 1908, Ottomanism (= equal Ottoman citizenship for all ethnic elements) triumphed officially but before a year had passed the Committee of Union and Progress had reluctantly to recognise there were irreconcilable tendencies among the nations that composed the Ottoman empire. The Turkist movement was growing rapidly.

On Dec. 24, 1908, the Turkish Assembly (Türk Dernesi) was founded at Stambul with the object of studying the situation and the activities (hayât ve-afâl) of all Turkish peoples. In practice, the interest of this body has been confined to questions of language, which have been discussed in the reviews Yeni-İslâm Gendİ şahmetler etc.

In 1911 the Turanian Society for the propagation of knowledge (Türan nehr-i mâyârî dînîyeti) was created and in December appeared No. I of the periodical Türk-yurdun edited by Y. Ak-çura.

On May 25, 1912, the Türk edaçlarî (Turkish Hearths) were founded, circles for the study of Turkish culture.

At the same time the great theorist of Turkism, Ziya Gök Alp [q. v.], elected in 1910 a member of the Central Committee of Union and Progress, began his activity first at Salonica (1909) and later at Stambul (1912). In a series of poetic works he aroused the memories dormant in the blood of the Turks and sang the Turkish ideal as personified in the mysterious land of Türkân: "The children of Oğuz-khan will never forget this country which is called Türkân" (Türkûk, 1911). This land is associated with Attila, Fârâbî, Ulugh Beg, Ibn Sinâ (the Turkish origins of the latter [q. v.] are not by any means proved). "The fatherland of the Turks is neither Turkey, nor Turkestan, their fatherland is the great eternal land of Türkân" (Türân, 1914).

The teaching of Ziya Gök Alp was summed up in the formula "Turkicise yourself (from the point of view of culture, hârî), Islamise yourself, modernise yourself (from the point of view of civilisation, medîniyet)". The systematic exposition of the theories of this writer will be found in Türkülâyün evâslari, "The foundations of Turkism", published at Angora in 1339 (1923) a year before the author's death. In this work, the idea of Türkân is a little more practical. Ziya Gök Alp defines the nation as a group of individuals connected by language, religion, ethics and aesthetics. Türkân is not a mixture of Turks, Mongols, Tungus, Finns and Hungarians. "The word Türkân is a name covering the Turk tribes exclusively". The reunion of the Turks can only be brought about by stages. The immediate ideal of Turkism is the cultural union of the Oğuz-Turks, i.e. the Turks of Turkey and the Turkomans of Azerbaijan, of Persia and Khâvizm. Their political union is not at present envisaged but one cannot foretell the future. On the other hand, if the Tatars, the Özbegs and the Kirghiz succeed in creating civilisations of their own and in forming separate nations, they will retain their respective names, but in that case "Türkân" will serve as a common term
for all the peoples enumerated, forming an ethnic
union (dığişi). The Türkân romanticism has had various reper-
cussions in the purely literary field in the works of Ağmaç Hikmat (Allah oordu), Khalide Edib Khañım (Yahşi Türkân, 1913), Ağa Gündüz (Müşterem hâtıl, a drama produced in 1914 whose subject is a Turkish rising in the Caucasus), Müfred Ferd Khañım (Ay Demir, a Turkish rising in Central Asia). On literary Türkânism during the War, cf. N. Hartmann, Al-A.Ö.S., 1918, xxii., p. 19-22.

During the War of 1914 in Western Turkey (Committee of Union and Progress) governing the Ottoman empire officially professed Ottomanism, at least so far as Muslims were concerned, but in fact the deportations of Armenians in 1915 were realising the programme of the Turkicisation of Turkey.

Expansion towards the East. The war of 1914 had drawn a curtain between the Turks of Turkey and their kinsmen. The Russian revolution of 1917 entirely modified the situation. By the clause added at the last minute to the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Turkey obtained the return to the frontiers of 1877 in Transcaucasia (surrender by Russia of Batum, Kars and Ardahan). The refusal of the Turks of Adharbaîdjan to resist the Ottomans put an end to the Transcaucasian confederation (April 22, 1918), which was replaced by three independent republics (Adharbaîdjan, Georgia and Armenia). Under the command of Enver Pâşâ's brother, the Turks advanced as far as Petrowsk on the Caspian Sea but the armistice of Madras (Oct. 30, 1918) forced them to turn back. The English then occupied and later taken part in all the phases of the Soviet revolution. For the moment (1930) it is impossible to separate the results of the particular and general factors and to say to what point the tendencies of all the peoples of Turkish origin are converging.

The communications and discussions at the first Turcological congress at Bükâ from Feb. 26 to March 6, 1926 (13 delegates, Soviet and foreign, including two from Turkey) were of great interest (see the shorthand reports published in Russian, Bükâ 1926, and Menzel's detailed analysis in Der Islam, 1918). The decision of the congress regarding the optional adoption of the Roman alphabet (compulsory since 1928) had a great influence on the introduction of the new alphabet into Turkey (1928) (cf. H. Duda, Die neue Lateinschrift in d. Türkei, O.L.Z., June 1929, col. 441-453; E. Rossi, N nuovo alfabeto, Oriento Moderno, Jan. 1929, p. 33-48).

It is difficult to foretell the future of the Pan-Turkish movement. The cultural attraction of Angora, this great centre of Turkism, is legitimate and inevitable. But Angora is now a lay capital entirely free from the Islamic prejudice of the Osmâni. The intensity of its influence will therefore depend primarily on the worth of the Turkish culture (hâlâ) which will be developed there. Even the bringing of all Turks "descended from Oghuz" under one culture according to Ziya Gök Alp's idea would not be easy, because, for example, the Persian Turks, the immediate neighbours of Turkey, are very much under the influence of Persia, the persistence of which is a historical fact. As to the political union of the Turkish peoples, account must be taken of the very different conditions under which they live. Their lands are very scattered. They are separated by the Caspian Sea and the desert. In Transcaucasia the corridor between Georgia and Armenia on the one side and Persia on the other is very narrow and is of no importance, unless a complete reversal of the situation in Transcaucasia and in Persia should take place simultaneously, which is quite beyond the programme of Turkism pure and simple.

Bibliography: A través-oglu, O lü tars istes, in the journal Türk, Cairo (reprinted Stambul 1927); Omer Seyfeddin, Türkîski Türkân dâvelâtî, Stambul 1930; Martin Hartmann, Chinesisch-Türkistan, Halle 1908, passim; do.
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N. 14 is the most detailed monograph on the turban and has been much used for the above article. Of other writings he mentions N. 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, but has himself only seen and used N. 8. In addition to N. 14 we have used N. 2 for some points.

Of European literature in addition to the works of Dozy, Karabacek and Brunot cited above we may mention a few general works on costume: Rosenberg, Geschichte des Kosτüm, 5 vols., plates with brief descriptions, p. 397 on the turban; J. v. Falke, Kostümgeschichte der Türkischen, 1st edn., 1845, Titelblatt, Die Trachten der Völker, Catalog der Lipperheideker Kostüm-bibliothek. — 16 forms of turban are illustrated by Fesquet, 44 different ones by Niebur, and no less than 286 are given by Michael Thaluan, Elémnus librorum or. miss., Vienna 1702, vi. 29 sq. on Cod, turc., vii., Bologna (according to E. L., ii. 751); cf. Victor Rosen, Remarques sur les miss. orientaux de la Collection Maréchal à Bologna (Atti della Real Acc. dei Lincei, 281, 1883—1884), p. 182. (W. BJÖRKMANN)

TURBAT-I HAİDARI. [See ZΩWA.]

TURBAT-I ŞAIKH-I DJAM, a place in the north-east of Persia (province of Khū- rāsān), not far from the Afghan frontier; its position is approximately 61° East Long. and 35° N. Lat. It is a stage on the Maghad-Ḥerāt road (the distance from Turbat-i Šaikh-i Djām to Maghad is about 96 miles, roughly half the distance between Maghad and Ḥerāt) and lies on a tributary of the Harrārūd. In the first half of the sixteenth century the number of houses was given at about 200 (Conolly, about 1830); towards the end of the century (1894) Yate put the number at about 250. The last named traveller observed that the place was called Djām by the inhabitants; the inhabitants themselves are called Djāmī. In 1894 there were about 4,000 families, all agriculturists; they used to have a chief of their own; when Yate visited the little town, however, the Djāmī were the direct authority of the district governor. Turbat-i Šaikh-i Djām has also a primitive citadel built of clay; east of the village is the tomb of the saint to which the village owes its name. He was the mystic Šaikh Ahmad-i Djāmī (d. 536 = 1142; cf. the article AHMAD DĪMĀ). According to Ibn Batūṭa (ed. Paris, i. 75 sqq.), he was called Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad and the place belonged to his descendants, quite free from the authority of the state. What Ibn Batūṭa further tells about the Šaikh is obviously local tradition without any great historical value. The town was visited by Timūr and at a later date by Humāyūn.

The mediseval name of Turbat-i Šaikh-i Djām was Būḍzān (also Pūčkan); Yākūt, iii. 890 sq., gives a further variant: Fuzz or Fuzzūle, while the nisba has the nisba al-Fazzūle; the nisba, al-Būḍzānī, of course, is also found). It was the capital of the district of Džām (also written Zām) in the N. E. of Kūhistān. According to Yākūt, Būḍzān lies 4 days' journey from Nisāfīr and 6 from Herāt, while al-শaḤārī (p. 272) gives 4 days' journey as the distance from Būḍzān to Būdhānji. The town, on which no fewer than 180 villages were dependent, lay in a fertile and well-watered neighbourhood. According to Ibn Rusta (p. 181), Džām belonged to the 19 raṣāfīk dependent on Nisāfīr. Al-Muγaddasī (at least according to the text quoted in de Goeje, p. 319, note e) says that the name Būḍzān is only applied to the town (ḵaṣr) proper, not to the whole district which included the villages depending on it (cf. the article SHAHR). We have the less doubt about this notice as the not very clear passage, p. 321, note b, again seems to identify al-ḵaṣr with al-madina.

Bibliography: G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 356 sqq.; E. Yate, Khurasan and Sistan, p. 35 sqq. C. Ritter, Erdkunde, viii. 264 sqq., 278, 286 sqq.; C. Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire... de la Perse, p. 121, 149 sq. (V. F. BÜCHNER)

TURFAN, usually written Turfan, locally pronounced Turfan, a town in Chinese Türk- istān. The oasis, fertile although suffering from a scarcity of water, between the depression of Lukčun, which lies below the sea-level, and the ranges of the Thian-šan, has been of importance from ancient times not only for trade between China and the west but also politically; the settlements mentioned in ancient times and the early middle ages were however not on the site of the modern Turfan but west and east of it. In the second century B. C. the principality of Kü-shi was here; in the year 60 a. c. it was destroyed by the Chinese and eight small principalities took its place, including anterior Kü-shi in the region of Turfan; the capital of this was the little town called Kiao- ho by the Chinese, the site of which is marked by the ruins about 4 miles west of Turfan called Yarkhoto by Klements (Nachrichten über die von der Kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu St. Petersburg im Jahre 1898 ausgestellte Expedition nach Turfan, St. Petersburg 1899, p. 24 sqq.). Considerable importance was later attained by the Chinese settlement Kao-chang, called in Turki first Khoro (Mah- mūd Khashghā, i. 103: Kudlā), later Kar-Khojā, now the ruins of Idukt-šahri, 20—25 miles east of Turfan. Immediately south of the modern town lie the ruins of Old Turfan by Klements (op. cit., p. 28); according to S. Franke (Eine chinesische Tempelinschrift aus Idikutshah bei Turfan, Anhang zu Abh. Preuss. Akad., 1907, p. 36) these ruins "must date from ancient times and have been an unimportant place"; but they occupy a rather larger area (3 square kilometres) than Idukt-šahri.

Turfan is not mentioned in the Mongol period and not on the Chinese map of 1315 (E. Bretschneider, Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources, vol. ii.). The only suggestion that there was perhaps a town of Turfan in ancient times is found in a Saka document found in the Tang-Hwang and published by Sten Konow (Oslo Etnografiske Museums Skrifter: Publications of the India Institute, iii. 3, Oslo 1929, p. 137 and 148) where a town called Turpānni is mentioned. The first Chinese (in the Ming-shi) reference to Turfan (Chinese T'u-lu-fan) is in the year 1377; some foreign em-
basses on the way to China were robbed at Turfan and the Chinese army was sent against the king of Turfan as a reprisal (Med. Res., ii. 193). To a somewhat later date belongs the first Muslim account of Turfan; according to the Tavârîḫ-i Ṭabâridî, Khîrâ Khodja, Khân of Moghulistan (c. 1389–1399), undertook a campaign against "Kara Khodja and Turfan, two very important towns on the frontiers of China"; the inhabitants were forced to adopt Islam and the two towns were henceforth regarded as within the territory of Islam (Dâr al-Islâm) (Tâvârîḫ-i Ṭabâridî, transl. Ross, p. 52). When the celebrated embassy of the Timurid Shâhrukh [q. v.] passed through the country in 823 (1420) the inhabitants were, however, for the most part still idolators; there was a large temple of idols there and a great statue of Buddha Sâkyamuni (Shâkemsûnî) and many other idols, some old, some of recent erection (N. E., xiv, p. 310 and the original text of Ḥâfiẓ-i Ābrū [q. v.] in Barthold, al-Mugaffârîya, p. 27). The present inhabitants of Turfan (Turfanîk) know that Uighurs used to live there, but these Uighurs are now considered to have been Muslims; all Buddhist relics are ascribed to the Kalmucks (Klementz, op. cit., p. 20) or to king Dâkyânûs [see Aṣâb al-Kahf].

Turfan suffered in those days from want of water even more than it does now. In the reign of Wâsân Khân (1418–1428) agriculture was conducted in a very primitive and laborious fashion; the Khân had a deep well dug and out of this he himself and his slave drew water for their fields in earthen vessels [kîzâ] (Tavârîḫ-i Ṭabâridî, p. 67). Conditions seem to have improved later; towards the end of the xviith century the land of Čâsh (the modern Karâshahr) obtained its corn from Turfan (Zap., xv, 251; quoted by M. Hartmann, Der islâmische Orient, i. 302). The present underground irrigation channels are said not to have been made till the xviiith century (Sir A. Stein, in Geogr. Journ., 1916, Sept., p. 47).

Under the princes claiming descent from Čâšghâlu Khân in the modern Chinese Turkestan (xvith—xviiith century) Turfan is frequently mentioned as the residence of various Khâns; at a later date it was, like the rest of the country, subjected first to the Kalmucks, then after the destruction of the Kalmuck empire in 1758 to the Chinese. In 1765 the town of Uč [west of Aš-šu, q. v.], which had rebelled against the Chinese, was destroyed and its population completely wiped out; in order to restore the town, inhabitants were imported from other towns, especially from Turfan. Uč was henceforth known as Uč-Turfan or Ush-Turfan; to distinguish the two, Turfan proper was called Old Turfan (Kûhûn Turfan). In the time of Yaḥîb Beg (1866–1877) Turfan was the frontier town of his dominions in the east; in 1876 it was visited by a famine and in 1877 occupied by the Chinese without resistance. Turfan now belongs to the territory of the "king" [wâng] of Lukkân. The first European to visit Turfan was Dr. A. Regel (see below) in 1879. The modern fort of Turfan is said by Regel to have been built by Yaḥîb Beg; east of it is the Chinese fort, which, according to Grum-Grîzmîlo (Opisanie put’eskostiyâ v Zapadnyi Kitai, i, St. Petersburg 1856, p. 275), was not built till 1886; but it is already mentioned by Regel. Still farther to the east, according to Regel, lay the "ruins of the Turfan of the last centuries "with" numerous fine tomb-mosques and a beautiful minaret". The minaret and the medrese, to which it belongs, have been several times illustrated (Klementz, op. cit., p. 49; O. Donner, Resa i Zentralasiien 1888, Helsingfors 1901, p. 120; A. v. le Coq, Auf Hells Spuren in Osttürkistan, Leipzig 1920, pl. 2). The minaret was not, as has been asserted, a Christian belfry, but was only built in 1760 by a monk of Lukkân. These ruins are probably identical with the Old Turfan of Klementz, which in this case would belong to a later date than Franke (see above) and Grünwedel ("a terribly ruined old town of the Uighur period") have assumed; Klementz also (op. cit., p. 28) seeks "to identify the Tu-lu-fan of the Ming geographers with the present Old Turfan, which lies S.E. of the modern Chinese Turfan". The ruins of most of the buildings of the old town seem to have been destroyed between 1879 and 1898, but, as Oldenburg established in 1909, more has survived than one would suppose from Klementz's description. The modern town is of some importance as a commercial centre; the highest estimate of the number of inhabitants is about 20,000. Bibliography: (in addition to the references in the article): A. Regel, Turfan, in Petermanns Mitteilungen, xxvi, 1886, p. 205 sqq.; Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, Oxford 1926, 566 sqq. Where further references are given: G. Grum-Grîzmîlo, Opisanie put’eskostiyâ v Zapadnyi Kitai, i, St. Petersburg 1856, chap. xii–xvii; A. Grünwedel, Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten in Idikutuschari und Umgebung im Winter 1902–1903, Munich 1905 (Abh. Bayer. Akad., Kl. i, vol. xxiv, ser. l), p. 45; S. Oldenburg, Russkaya Turkestanskaya Ekspeditsiya 1909–1910, St. Petersburg 1914, p. 25.

(W. BARTHOLOM

TURGAI, THE NAME OF A RIVER SYSTEM AND OF A SMALL TOWN IN THE STEPPES OF CENTRAL ASIA. The main river Turgai is formed of the Karîn-sâfil Turgai, which receives the Tastâ Turgai, and the Kara Turgai, and flows into Lake Durukta; north of it runs the Saf Turgai, which is called Uلكun-tamid in its upper course and receives from the west the Muidoîl-Turgai and the Sarf-bui Turgai. The Sarf Turgai flows into Lake Sarf-Kopa. In Turkish turghai orurga means "little bird" (Radloff, Württemberg, iii. 1184, 1457); Kara Turgai is a name of the starling. The fortifications of Orenburg are called Torgai Kala. The modern Turgai on the river of the same name was built in 1845 by Major Tomilin as a fortress and one of the centres of Russian power among the Kirgiz [q. v.] under the name of the Orenburg fortress (Orenburgskoe Ukreplenie). In 1865 the territory of the Orenburg Kirgiz was divided into two provinces (oklæst), the Ural and the Turgai. When the Turgai province in 1868 was divided into districts (wâneg), the fortress was made the capital of the district and called Turgai. As there was no suitable centre in the province itself, the Turgai province was administered from Orenburg. The governor lived there and in it was published from 1881 the official gazette, Turgaiyskaia Oblastnaia Vezdomost. Among the four capitals of district in this province, the town of Turgai only takes the third place and has never been important; the number of inhabitants was to the east, according to the census of 1897 was only 896, to that of 1911, 1,657. The southern part of the province with the town of Turgai is less suitable for agriculture and Russian
colonisation than the north, on account of the scarcity of fertile areas, although in the sixties about 1.300 hectares were cultivated on the river Turgai alone. From Turgai, trade routes lead northwards to Orsk and Kustanai, and southwards to Irizig and Perowsk (now called Kzfl-Orda).

Before Russian rule the present Turgai territory was inhabited only by nomads and hardly mentioned in political history. An exception is Nasawi's account (ed. Houdas, p. 999.) of the campaign of the Khiwarim-shsh [q.v.] Muhammad in the year 612 (1215-1216) against the Kipshak and his encounter with the Mongols; cf. Barthold, Turkistan etc. = G. M. S., N. S. v., p. 370 sq.; J. Marquart, Österrische Dialektstudien, Vienna 1914, p. 128 sqq. where on p. 133 a later date (midsummer 1219) is assumed.

Turgai now belongs to the autonomous republic of Kazakhstan. Instead of the earlier division into provinces and districts, the land is now divided into administrative areas (okrug); the town of Turgai now belongs to the area Aktyubinsk, the most southerly part of the former Turgai province to the area of Kzfl-Orda.

Bibliography: Rossiya, xviii.; Kirgizskiy Kraj, Petersburg 1903, esp. p. 341 sq. and map; articles by Ya. Polferov and A. Kaufman, in Encikloped. Slovar', Brogkaus-Elron, xxxiv. (1902); Asiaitskaya Rossiya, i., Petersburg 1914, p. 347 and 351. — On modern conditions I have been informed by word of mouth.

(W. BARTHOLD)

TURKISTAN or TURKESTAN, a Persian word meaning the "land of the Turks". To the Persians of course only the southern frontier of the land of the Turks, the frontier against Iran, was of importance and this frontier naturally depended on political conditions. On their very first appearance in Central Asia in the sixth century A.D., the Turks reached the Oxus (cf. Amd-Daryâ). In the time of the Sasanians therefore the land of the Turks began immediately north of the Oxus; according to the story given in Tabari (i. 435 sq.) the Oxus was settled by an arrow-shot of Irak as the frontier between the Turks and the "country of the nomads" of the Persians. According to the Armenian Sebekos (seventh century A.D.) the Vehro, i.e. the Oxus, rises in the land of Turk'istan (Histoire d'Héraclius par l'épique Sekobis, transl. by Fr. Macler, Paris, 1904, p. 49; J. Marquart, Erzähnh., p. 48); in another passage in the same work (p. 43; Marquart, p. 73) Turk'istan is associated with Delhistan i.e. Dehistan (in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea, north of the Atrek [q.v.]).

By the victories of the Arabs, the Turks were driven far back to the north; for the Arab geographers of the third (nineth) and fourth (tenth) centuries, Turkistan therefore began, not immediately north of the Oxus, but only north of the area of Arab culture known as "the lands beyond the river" Mâ warâ al-Nahr [q.v.]. Turkistan, the land of the Turks, was then regarded as the regions north and east of Mâ warâ al-Nahr. The town of Kásân in Farghana [q.v.] north of the Sh-Daryâ [q.v.], was "where the land of Turkistan begins" (Yaküt, iv. 277). The towns of Djan and Shahr-kand on the lower course of the same river were in Turkistan (op. cit., ii. 127; iii. 344); Turgai lay on the town of Khotan (op. cit., ii. 403). From this use of the name it has been held (especially by M. Hartmann, Chinesisch-Turkestân, Halle 1908, p. 1) that the name "Turkestan" was first applied by the Russian conquerors of Central Asia quite arbitrarily to the land of Mâ warâ al-Nahr. As a matter of fact, the name Turkistan had long regained its earlier significance as a result of the Turkish conquests, perhaps less in literature than in everyday usage. To the people of Persia and Afghanistan the "Turks in Turkistan" were their immediate neighbours on the north; thus in a ballad taken down in Shiraz in 1856 we are told "Two Turks came from Turkestan, brought me to Hindustân." The Žukovskiy, Obrasči persiyskâyi narodnogo tworčestva, St. Petersburg, 1902, p. 169 sq.) Through the Özbek conquests of the xviith century a new Turkistan arose south of the Amû-Daryâ. The corresponding province of Afghanistân still bears the name of Turkistan; as the southern frontiers of this Turkistan some travellers (R. Burslem, A Peep in Toorkistan, London, 1846, p. 57 sq.) give the pass of Ač Rabat north of Bamiyân [q.v.]; others (J. Wood, A Journey to the Source of the River Oxus, new edition, London 1872, p. 130) the pass of Hadjikak, a little farther south, where the watershed between the basins of the Helmand [q.v.] and the Amû Daryâ is; farther west, in the region between the Murghâb and the Aî-i Maimana, the frontier of Turkistan is given as the range of Band (or Tīrband-i) Turkistan. The name Turkistan was introduced into the scientific terminology of the xixith century, not by the Russians but by the English, probably under the influence of the Persian and Afghan usage.

In literature, especially in travellers' records, a distinction has usually been made between Russian, Chinese and Afghan Turkestan, although the word Turkestan (or Turkistan) had an administrative significance only in Russia and Afghanistan. Sometimes instead of these we find the terms West and East Turkestan. The governor-generalship of Turkestan was founded in 1867 by the Russians with Taşkent [q.v.] as its capital. The frontiers of this governor-generalship were sometimes contracted, sometimes extended. From 1882 to 1898 the province of Semiringovskye, at one time included in Turkestan, belonged to the governor-generalship of the Steppes with Omsk as its capital. In 1898 Semiringovskiy and the Transcaspian province (Turkomania) were incorporated in Turkestan.

In 1886 Prof. I. Muškhotov attempted to give the name "Turkestan" a definite geographical significance, independent of administrative conditions. Under the influence of A. Petzhold's book Umschau im Russischen Turkestan (1877), he proposed to give the name of Turkestan to the basin of the river between the central mountains of Central Asia and the basin of the Caspian Sea, the Iranian plateau and the sea of ice; Muškhotov had no doubt that the frontier between Russia and England in the not distant future would be established on the Hindû-Kush [q.v.]. He proposed to replace the term "Chinese Turkestan" by the Chinese Han-hai (interpreted by European scholars since Richthofen as the "dry sea"). Muškhotov deals only with geographical facts and hypotheses, without regarding the etymological significance of the words or any ethnographical considerations.

Mainly on ethnographical grounds the word Turkestan has gradually dropped out of use.
in Soviet Russia. After the revolution, a "Turkestan republic" lasted a few years with the old capital Tashkent. In comparison with the earlier governor-generalship the area of this republic was much smaller; in the north isolated parts were attached to the Kirgiz republic [cf. KIRGIZ]. After the principle of nationality had been finally carried through in 1924, the common name of the land had to give way to terms formed of the names of the various peoples like Uzbekistan, Türkmenistan and Tajikistan. Only a few, mainly economic questions, are still settled in Tashkent for all the lands in question; for Turkestan in such cases the expression Central Asia (Srednyaya Aziya) is used.

Turkestan was also the name in use among the Özbegs for a town on the middle course of the Sfr Daryā. From the accounts of the Arab geographers it may be assumed that in the fourth (tenth) century the town of Shāvghar (in Le Strange, Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, p. 485: Šāvghar) must have stood there: unfortunately no trace of it has been found. In the xivth century and probably as early as the xiiith, the later Turkestan was called Yasi and is mentioned as late as the history of Timūr (Zafar-Nāma, Ind. ed., ii. 9) as a village (baryā). The importance of the town increased from the cult — first known in the Mongol period — of the saint Aḥmad Yeşewi [q. v.], regarded as the converter of the Turks to Islām (on his period see also Barthold, in Der Islam, xiv. 112), and especially after the splendid tomb was erected there by Timūr. The saint was regarded as the patron of the land of the Turks and was called Hadrat-i Turkestān, which probably explains the new name of the town. At the time of the Russian conquest the circumference of the town was about 2 miles, the population about 5,000 and in 1908 it had risen to 15,000.


TURKMĀN-ČAI (better T-cayl), a village in the district of Gärmarūd in the province of Aḥdharbāidžān. Türkmen-čai, "the river of the Turkomans", is really the name of the stream on which the village stands; it comes down from the Čakčal pass (between Türkmen-čai and Sarāb). It is one of the northern tributaries of the river of Miyāna (Šāhhr-čayl) which flows into the Kshlūzān (cf. the article SAPF-ĐUD). The village of Türkmen-čai marks a stage on the great Tabriz-Zandžān-Kəzwin-Tīhrān-Khurāsān road. The distances are Tabriz-Türkmen-cai c. 60 miles; Türkmen-čai-Zandžān c. 80 miles. Hamdullāh in the Nushat al-Kulub, G. M. S., xxiii. 183, puts these distances at 16 and 25 farsāqāhs respectively. He calls the village Türkmen-čandā; the word kandā = village, only used in Aḥdharbāidžān and unknown elsewhere in Persia, is certainly of eastern Iranian origin (cf. Sogdian, kandh, town; cf. Barthold, Istorīya Kultur, Žiizni Turkestana, Leningrad 1927, p. 381; the word must have been brought into Aḥdharbāidžān by Turkish invaders. Ḥamdullāh also says that at one time the village was a town, the Iranian name of which, Dīb Kharrān (several variants), he gives. Claevi, ed. Szejniewski (St. Petersb. 1881, p. 172 and 354), calls Türkman-čai Tucelar and Tunnglar (evidently a corruption of Türk-lār) and says that it is inhabited by Turkomans.

Türkman-čai is known in history from the treaty signed there between Russia and Persia on Feb. 10/22, 1828. This diplomatic document consists of two parts. 1. By virtue of the political treaty, which was to take the place of the treaty of 1823, annexed the khanates of Kizwān and Naft Kizwān and received from Persia a contribution of 5,000,000 tīmāns = 20,000,000 roubles, but this was later reduced. 2. A special agreement fixed at 5% ad valorem the customs duties between the two countries and regulated the personal status of Russian subjects; in criminal cases they were to be tried by Russian courts, civil cases concerning both nationalities were dealt with by Russo-Persian tribunals with the participation of the Russian consular representatives etc. This particular agreement of 1828 is the historical origin of the Persian capitulations. By the most favoured nation clause, all the states of Europe in time secured similar rights. On its accession to power in 1917 the Soviet government renounced sua sponte all the old political and judicial privileges in Persia and this renunciation was sealed by the Soviet-Persian treaty of Feb. 28, 1921. Since 1928 Persia has shown a desire to abrogate capitulations generally, but not till May 10, 1927 did she address a circular note to this effect to the powers, several of whom, from May 10, 1928, have made new treaties on a basis of equality.

The frontiers of 1828 between Russia and Persia (Little Ararat-Caspian Sea) still remained unchanged even after 1921.

Bibliography: Türkman-čai is mentioned by all the travellers who have gone from Tabrīz- Kužvin, cf. Hommaire de Hell, Voyage, Paris 1854-1860, iii. 83-84 (the village has 200 houses) and the atlas pl. i-vi. (room where the treaty was signed); Brueghel, Reise, Leipzig 1862-1864, i. 181; Lycklama a. Nijeholt, Voyage, ii. 85; H. Schindler, Reisen, Zeit. Frei. Geol. Erdk., 1883, p. 333 (100 houses, altitude 5285 feet).


TURKOMANS, a Turkish people in Central Asia. The name has been used since the fifth (xith) century, first in the Persian plural form Turkomān, by the Persian historians Gardīd [q. v.] (cf. also now the printed edition by Muh. Nazim, E. G. Browne Mem., vol. i, Berlin 1928) and Abu 'l-Faḍl Bāḥ&q.v. in the same sense as the Turkish Oghuz, Arab. Ghuṣ [q. v.]. The Oghuz of course used to live in Mongolia, where they are mentioned as early as the Orkhon
are found to agree; the Jews therefore believe that 'Uzair must be the son of God.

Alongside of this legend we find a fuller one as early as Tabari's commentary on the Kur'an (and frequently later). Israel is oppressed by 'Amâlek (the Philistines). The learned men bury the Torah. 'Uzair laments and prays in the mountains. One day he meets at a tomb a woman (in reality she is no earthly woman but Dunyâ, the world) who seems to be lamenting him that fed and clothed her. 'Uzair asks her who she is and what he has done to her husband. She replies "Allâh!". But, says 'Uzair, Allâh still lives. The woman then asks who had taught mankind before Israel. "Allâh!", replies 'Uzair. But Allâh still lives, says the supernatural woman. At her bidding 'Uzair now consecrates himself and swallows something an old man puts in his mouth namely a glass, like a large coal. 'Uzair now announces that he has the Torah within him. He is branded as a liar. He then ties a pen to each finger and writes the Torah. The "Ulâmâ" dig up the Torah and find complete agreement; from this they conclude that 'Uzair must be the son of God.

In R. E. F., 1904, xlii. 209, I have pointed out that an Arabic apocryphon has survived in these legends which corresponds to IV. Ezra where we are told that God had given Israel lands and instruction but when they sinned he took them away. Ezra is given a goblet full of flaming water. Then his breast swells with wisdom, teaching flows from his heart, and for 40 days on end he dictates to five men (in the Muslim legend they are his fingers) the sacred books (IV. Ezra, xiv. 18—49).

Sûra ii. 261 is sometimes explained as referring to Ezra (more often to Jeremiah): "He passed by a city which had been destroyed to its foundations. How shall God quicken this dead city to life? God caused him to die for a hundred years and then raised him to life and asked: how long hast thou stayed here? He answered: probably a day or less. But God replied: thou hast stayed here one hundred years. Look on thy food and drink, it is not corrupted; and look on thy ass: we make thee a wonder unto men; look also on the bones, which God has raised and clave them with flesh."

The following legend is associated with this passage: Nebuchadnezzar slew 40,000 men of learning including 'Uzair's father and grandfather. 'Uzair being a child was spared but already he was advanced in the Torah. When he asks whether the town will arise again, God plunges him into sleep for a hundred years. After a hundred years he awakens, his ass is still alive and his food uncorrupted. He appears as a man of twenty among his children and grandchildren who are now greybeards, proves his identity by making a blind girl see and, particularly by restoring the Torah. The original Torah is dug up out of a vineyard and found to agree: 'Uzair must be the son of God.


In 660 (Ibn al-Âthir, xii. 128) Abû Bakr sent Ay-tempshe to disposses of Kîkê and all the meanwhile taken Râyi, Hâmâm and Djâbal (Media). Kîkê was killed and Uzbek became maîîk, with Ay-tempshe as advisor and guardian. In 662 Ay-tempshe came to the help of Abû Bakr and enabled him to take Marâgha [q. v.] but in the end only allowed him to have Âdharbâyjân and Arrân (ibid., p. 186, 194).

Uzîbek-âtâbêk. Uzbek had already retired to the north where in 607 (1210) he succeeded Abû Bakr (Ibn al-Âthir says nothing of this).

In 608 another slave Mângli took the place of Ay-tempshe who was finally slain in 610 (ibid., p. 194, 196, 197). Mângli took up an independent attitude to his master Uzbek. The caliph took the side of Uzbek and brought about the intervention of the Atâbêk of Irbiîl in his favour. The lands of Mângli were divded and Uzbek gave his share to his slave Aghamâsh (in 612; ibid., p. 201). It should however be noted that Aghamâsh said the khûûfâ in name of the Khwârizmshâh and the latter regarded him as his lieutenant (cf. Nasawi, p. 13).

In 614, the Ismâ'îlîans assassinated Aghamâsh and the Atâbêk of Fârs Sa'd occupied Râyi and Uzîbek Işfâhân. Hearing this the Khwârizmshâh 'Ali' al-Dîn Muhammad came to Djâbal (Media) and scattered the allies. Uzbek withdrew to Âdharbâyjân while his dignitaries, the prince of Ahar Nuşrat al-Dîn Bêshgân (of Georgian origin) and the vizier Rabîb al-Dîn, were captured. By an arrangement with Uzbek the Khwârizmshâh left him Âdharbâyjân and Arrân, but forced him to read the khûûfâ and strike coins in his name (cf. Ibn al-Âthir, xii. 207; Nasawi, p. 17).

The Mongols. When in 617 (1220) the Tatars appeared before the walls of Tabriz, Uzbek, who was spending his days and nights in drinking bouts, took the cowardly but prudent plan of paying a ransom for the city to them (ibid., p. 244).

The Georgians, beaten a first time by the Tatars, proposed an alliance with Uzbek and the lord of Khatât, but the Tatars reinforced by troops whom a Turkish slave of Uzbek named Aqût (Aqûtsh) had collected for them, frustrated these plans by a new attack on Tiflis [q. v.] and came in 618 for a second time to Tabriz. Once again Uzbek ransomed the city (ibid., p. 245). When they came to Tabriz for a third time (ibid., p. 250), Uzbek left for Nakhchîwân and sent his family to Khôjî. "He held all Âdharbâyjân and all Arrân and in spite of this was the most helpless creature to protect his country against the enemy" says Ibn al-Âthir (ibid., p. 250).

In 619 the Kidchê, who had penetrated into Transcaucasia via Derbend, stirred up trouble in Arrân and later the Georgians, perhaps enraged at the failure of their new offer of an alliance, sacked Bâla-kân (ibid., p. 266). Towards the end of the year (Oct. 1222), we find Uzbek again inactive at Tabriz but he must have had a certain amount of influence, for an amir of Mawûsî had put himself under his protection (ibid., p. 268).

In 620 during a quiet period that followed the withdrawal of the Mongols, trouble broke out in Persia between the son of Khwârizmshâh Ghiyât al-Dîn and his uncle Ighan-taîsi; Uzbek, accom-

panied by his slave Aîheb al-Shîmî, marched against Ghiyât al-Dîn but was defeated (Ibn al-Âthir, xii. 270). According to Nasawi, p. 76, Ghiyât al-Dîn, when he had established himself in the ûrûk, undertook operations against Âdharbâyjân (Marâgha, Üdân) and Uzbek endeavoured to pacify him by giving him in marriage his sister, the princess of Nakhchãnâvân; on the other hand, Ighan-
taîsi twice came and pillaged Âdharbâyjân (cf. Ibn al-Âthir, xii. 281).

In 621 new Tatar forces invaded Persia and defeated the Khwârizmshans at Râyi. The survivors sought refuge with Uzbek but the Tatars appeared before Tabriz and demanded that they should be handed over. Uzbek killed a number and sent the others to the Tatars. According to Ibn al-Âthir, there were only 3,000 Tatars while the Khwârizmshans defeated at Râyi numbered 6,000 and Uzbek's forces were more numerous than either (ibid., p. 273).

In 622 (1225) the Georgians set out from Tiflis against Âdharbâyjân. The expedition was destroyed in a defile. The Georgians were preparing to avenge this reverse when suddenly came the news of the arrival of Djâlîl al-Dîn at Marâgha and again the Georgians sought an alliance with Uzbek.

Arrival of Djâlîl al-Dîn. Before the approach of Djâlîl al-Dîn, Uzbek withdrew to Gandja while a Khwârizmî commander was admitted into Tabriz. On the 16th Radjab 622 (June 24, 1225), Djâlîl al-Dîn occupied the town.

During the absence of Djâlîl al-Dîn in Georgia, a plot was hatched at Tabriz to bring back Uzbek, in which so important a man as Shems al-Dîn Tughhrî took part, but Djâlîl al-Dîn arrived in time to check it. The Khwârizmshâh dealt Uzbek a blow, which he felt deeply, by marrying his wife, the daughter of Tughhrî II. Legal authorities were found to bring grounds for a divorce between Uzbek and the princess, but the scandal was considerable. The princess was afterwards neglected by Djâlîl al-Dîn and she finally appealed to the Ayûbid Malik Aşhrâf and the latter in 624 sent an expedition to Âdharbâyjân which brought the princess to Khîlî (Ibn al-Âthir, p. 307; Nasawi, p. 154).

Gandja also was lost to Uzbek and he spent his last days (622 = 1225) in the fortress of Allândja (cf. Minorsky, Transcaucasia, in T.A., 1930, July, p. 93) overwhelmed by his misfortunes and humiliations (cf. Nasawi, p. 119; Djuwâni, i. 157). With him ended the rule of the Atâbêks descended from Ildêgiz (Eldîgûz).

Uzbek left one son whose name seems to have been Kîfîl Arslân (Nasawi, p. 165, contrary to the Ôâdat al-Sûdûr, p. 393, where he is called Tughhrî), but he was generally known as Khâmûsh ("the silent") for he was deaf and dumb (cf. Nasawi, p. 129 - 130; Qâlîmî, ii. 248).

Uzbek is very severely judged by the historians. Ibn al-Âthir, departing from his usual judicial calm, returns several times to the charge (xii. 244, 250, 267, 281) and accuses him of being devoted to wine, good living and games of chance (al-kûnâr bi 'l-hâid, "the game of eggs"). The Atâbêk led an indolent life and for months never left his home (cf. also Yâtî, s. v. Urmîya, i. 219). This gloomy picture must have been a contrast to the hopes which at this time Muslims were placing on Djâlîl al-Dîn who, however, was never able to free himself from the exercise of his own life (Nasawi, p. 186,
was forced to shut himself up in Mardin [q.v.].
This took place in 858 (1454) and soon Hasan occupied Ruhâ and laid siege to Mardin (cf. ʿAḥkāmī, pâšâ-zâde, p. 247–249; Müneþedji-m-bâšhi, iii. 157).

The intervention of Hasan’s mother, a female diplomat who played a great part in later developments, forced Usûn Hasan to return to Diyar Bakr. He sought to recompense himself by a raid on Kara-Koyunlu territory (Erzerum, Arnav, Balburt) but having failed to take Erzincan returned to Diyar Bakr.

On resuming the siege of Erzincan, Usûn Hasan fell from his horse and was seriously injured. Diþîângir seized the opportunity to sack the environs of Āmid but on Hasan’s return sought refuge with the Kara-Koyunlu Diþîhan-Shâh. His mother once more installed Hasan in Diyar Bakr and Diþîângir in Mardin. The struggle was very soon resumed on a larger scale. Hasan marched on Erzincan and Turdîan, from which he drove ʿArab-Shâh, his brother’s representative, and then attacked Khurassân and Karadj-Dagh (S. W. of Diyar Bakr). The Kara-Koyunlu Diþîhan-Shâh sent his amirs to the help of Diþîângir but Usûn Hasan defeated them in 861 (May 1457); cf. Ibn Taghrî-brîdî, ed. Popper, vii. 485). Diþîângir gave his son as a hostage, and another brother of Hasan (Uwais of Ruhâ) also submitted to him. Usûn Hasan installed the amir Khurshid Beg (perhaps his cousin; cf. Müneþedji-m-bâšhi, iii. 376) in Erzincan. This fortress was the key to the Armenian plateau. About the same time, Hasan gave shelter to the Kara-Koyunlu Hasan ʿAlt who had rebelled against his father Diþîhan-Shâh, but had soon to expel him on account of his heretical opinions. These events occupied the years 858–861 after which began the rapid rise of Hasan and the extension of his influence over the neighbouring lands.

 Operations in Kurdistân. On the Tigris he took ʿHân Khâfî from the Kurd mallaks descended from the Aiyûbids (cf. Šaraf-nâme, ii. 149–155) and gave this fortress to his son ʿHâlî. Shîrîn Hatîhan (in Bothîk) were later occupied (cf. also Šaraf-nâme, ii. 9).

Usûn Hasan between Karâman and Trebizond. In the west, the successes of Usûn Hasan brought him into conflict with the Ottomans who under the leadership of Muhammed II had just completed the subjection of the feudal principalities of Asia Minor. The princes of Karâman [q.v.], greatly threatened by the Ottomans, endeavoured to enter into an alliance with their eastern neighbour Usûn Hasan. On the other hand, Usûn Hasan became involved in the affairs of the empire of Trebizond, which was then almost at its end. In 1458, the last emperor of Trebizond, David, gave Usûn Hasan the daughter of his brother and predecessor Kalo-Ioannes, named Catherine, in marriage (in Europe she is more often called by her title Despina; cf. the Venetian travellers). Trebizond was closely linked with Georgia, while Venice and Rome were closely watching events in these two Christian states. The Muslim sources entirely neglect this complex of international political interests (cf. W. Miller, Trebizond, the last Greek Empire, London 1926; Uspensky, Otkri po istorii Trapez. impérii, Leningrad 1926).

The embassies sent by Usûn Hasan to Constantinople in 1457 and 1460 revealed to the Sulṭân
WAKF — WAKHÂN

27 with 2,000 inhabitants. The population (Wakhis) belongs to the race of Iranian mountaineers (Ghâlta) very often with blue eyes, a feature which had struck the Chinese as early as the sixth century. The Wakh language is an unusual variety of an Iranian dialect (Ghâlta). At the present day the Wakhis on the Russian side form part of the autonomous republic of Tadjikistan.

In his monumental works Sir Aurel Stein supports the thesis according to which the Wakhân corridor ("the most direct thoroughfare") has been used from very early times for communication between the settled areas of northern Afghanistan (Balkh) and those of the modern Chinese Turkestan.

From the seventh century, Wakhân is continually mentioned in the early Chinese sources under the names of Hu-mî, Po-ho etc. (cf. Marquart, Eränähr, p. 243, and Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-juïne occidentaux, Index). Hiuen Tsang mentions the greenish eyes of the people of Ta-mo-si-tie-ti (a form not yet satisfactorily explained) and its capital Hun-t'ô-to (= Khândud) with its great Buddhist vihâra. In 747 Wakhân had become the theatre of the operations of the famous Chinese general Kao-sien-ë against the Tibetans (cf. Chavannes, p. 152—153). Among Arab authors, Ištakhrî (< Balkh) several times mentions Wakhân as a land of infuls, as the place from which musk comes and where the Oxus rises (cf. Ištakhrî, p. 279, 280, 296; Ibn Rusta, p. 91). Mas'ûdî, Marâjî, i. 213; Tumbh, p. 64, applies the term " Türk" to all the inhabitants of the upper Oxus: the Wakhân (Wâkhân) (لُوحَانٌ, fø: ...), Tubbât (Tibetans) and Ayghân (?). As to the Iranian Wakhis the term " Türk" can only refer to their dynasty (cf. Marquart, Whârât und Arang [still unpublished], p. 101—102). More detailed information is supplied by the Persian geographical work Īšâ'îd al-Imâm (372 = 982, ed. Barthold, 1930, fol. 259) which calls Wakhân the residence of the king and capital. (dâh) of Sikâshim (it ought probably to be understood to *Ishkashim, the capital of Wakhân).* At Khâmadâm (Khândud) are the temples (but-khana) of the Wakhis and "to its left" was a fortress occupied by the Tibetans. Samarkandâk is regarded as the remotest frontier of the dependencies of Transoxiana; it had Hindu, Tibetan and Wakhî inhabitants (probably the Sarhadh of the present day).