

E. J. BRILL'S
FIRST
ENCYCLOPAEDIA
OF ISLAM

1913-1936

EDITED BY

M. TH. HOUTSMA, A. J. WENSINCK,
H. A. R. GIBB, W. HEFFENING and E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL

Photomechanical Reprint

VOLUME VII
S—ṬAIBA

E. J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1987

corner-stones of the Ka'ba and as such we must consider also the Maḳām Ibrāhīm.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Kalbi, *Kitāb al-Aḡ-
nām*, Cairo 1332/1914; al-Azraqī, in Wüstenfeld,
Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, vol. i., Leipzig
1858, pp. 78, 84, 267 *sqq.*; Yāqūt, *Mu'djam*,
ed. Wüstenfeld, *passim*; 'Abd al-Kādir al-Bagh-
dādī, *Khizānat al-Adab*, Cairo 1299, iii. 242—
246; Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*²,
Berlin 1897; Nöldeke-Schwally, *Geschichte des
Qorāns*; Marquart and de Grodt in *Festschrift-
Sachau*, Berlin 1915, p. 283 *sqq.*; W. Robert-
son Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*.

(F. KRENKOW)

SANĀR (P., a corruption of *sad alnār*), the name given in the reign of Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh of Persia (1212—1250 = 1797—1834) to a silver coin, the half 'abbāsi or maḥmūdī; it weighed 36 grains (2.34 grammes). With its multiples it was abolished at Faṭḥ 'Alī's reform of the currency in the thirtieth year of his reign.

(J. ALLAN)

SANDĀBIL, said to be the capital of China. The name and description of the town in Yāqūt (*Mu'djam*, iii. 451, 5) and Zakariyā al-Ḳazwīnī (*'Adjā'ib al-Makhlūḳāt*, ii. 30 *sq.*) are taken from the undoubtedly fraudulent story of his travels by Abū Dulaf Mis'ar b. Muḥalhil (see the art. MIS'AR), who claims to have accompanied an embassy of the Chinese king Kālīn b. al-Shakhī to the Sāmānid Naṣr b. Aḥmad († 331 = 943) from Khurāsān back to China. J. Marquart (*Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, p. 84 *sqq.*, esp. p. 89) endeavours to show that Sandābil and Kan-čou (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 Khagan of the Uigurs of Kan-čou". This Khagan is said "to have felt threatened by the steadily increasing power of the Kitan", and "to have sought support and an alliance from the powerful Sāmānid". On the question of the origin of the name Sandābil for Kan-čou, Marquart only gives the suggestion made to him by de Goeje that Abū Dulaf confused Kan-čou with Č'ing-tufu (in Marco Polo Sindafu), well known as the capital of the province of Sz'čwan, 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 Abū 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 bears to historical facts. Nowhere is there the slightest mention of embassies from China to Khurāsān or vice versa nor of the matrimonial alliance said to have been arranged (Yāqūt, iii. 45, 22).

(W. BARTHOLD)

ŞANDAL, Sandalwood. According to al-Nuwairī, 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 *pterocarpus* imported from Southern Asia, the

islands of the Malay Archipelago and Africa is used for fine furniture and the waste as dye-woods.

Bibliography: O. Warburg, *Die Pflanzenwelt*, ii. 220; Abū Maṣū'ir Muwaffaq, ed. Seligmann, p. 164; transl. by Abdul-Chalig Achundow, p. 227; al-Ḳazwīnī, *'Adjā'ib al-Makhlūḳāt*, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 258; Ibn al-Baitār, transl. Leclerc, ii. 383; E. Wiedemann, *Beiträge*, xlix., *S.B.P.M.S. Erl.*, 1916, p. 38 (al-Nuwairī). (J. RUSKA)

SANDJAK (T.), 1) flag, standard, banner (Arabic *liwā'*), especially of a large size (more important than the *bayrak*, Ar. *rāya* or 'alam) and suitable for fixing in the ground or hoisted permanently on a monument or a ship; 2) (nautical term) ensign; pennant (*ikindji sandjak*), starboard; 3) formerly a military fief or *khāṣṣ* of a certain extent in the Ottoman empire; 4) a Turkish administrative and territorial division; 5) (in the expression *sandjak tiken-i* or *diken-i*, from the Turkish translation of *burhān-i kāfi*, p. 88, 25) a synonym of *sindjan tiken-i* (on this plant see Barbier de Meynard [ii. 101], who gives it as a Persian word).

As al-Ḳalkāshandī pointed out in the xvth century (*Ṣubḥ al-a'ṣḥā*, v. 458), *sandj-ak* comes from the verb *sandj-mak* (not *sandjī-mak*, as in the author already quoted) which means "to sting, prick, plant, stick a weapon or pointed object in the body of an enemy or in the ground (cf. Sāmī-Bey, *Kāmūs-i Türki*). The form *sancaḳ* found in Čaghatāi (Boudagov) and even in an old Serbian loanword (Miklosich, *Die türkischen Elemente in den südost-europäischen Sprachen*, Vienna 1884, ii. 50) corresponds to the verb *sanč* 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 *shansh* (Radloff, *Wörterbuch*, iv. 949) and in Uriankhay *shanish* and *čanish* (Katanov, *Opit izledovania*, p. 429 and 779, with the meaning "to prick, stab, erect, fix"). Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī (xith cent.), *Diwān Luḡāt al-Türk*, ii. 171, 180, 182 and iii. 310, also gives (iii. 108) *sandjghan* equivalent to *sandjan* (*sindjan*) already quoted, which is a Turkish participle used as the name of a prickly plant.

The word *sandjak* 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 *san-igḥ*, *sandjīkh*, *sandjīk*, *čančkī* (Tobolsk), *shanishī* (Kirghiz), *sandjīghī*, *sandjī* (whence *sandjī-mak* in Othmanli). We may add on the authority of Abū 'l-Fidā' and the Turk.-Arab glossary published by Houtsma, Leiden 1894, p. 80 and p. 29 of the Arabic text, the proper name *Sandjar*, glossed *vafan*, in preference to the usually accepted etymology from *Sindjar*, the name of his place of birth (cf. *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, i. 1872; cf. Index under *Sindjar*).

Sandjak has passed into a certain number of other languages; more recently into the Balkan languages (cf. the work by Miklosich quoted above and Saineanu, *Influenta Orientalia*) and earlier into Arabic (cf. Dozy, *Suppl.*; cf. also W. Marçais, *Le dialecte arabe de Tlemcen*, Paris 1902, p. 270, 90, 92) and into Persian where, according to the *Burhān-i kāfi*, it means or meant a "flag, a large metal pin intended to keep on the head a kind of hood worn by women"; "a kind of girdle". In Modern Persian *sandjūk* (sic) simply means "pin" (in opposition to "needle") (cf. Nicolas,

E. J. BRILL'S
FIRST
ENCYCLOPAEDIA
OF ISLAM

1913-1936

EDITED BY

M. TH. HOUTSMA, A. J. WENSINCK,
H. A. R. GIBB, W. HEFFENING and E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL

Photomechanical Reprint

VOLUME VIII
ṬĀʿIF—ZŪRKHĀNA

E. J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KØLN
1987

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 'Alawid Sultān Mawlāy 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 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh al-Tamsāmānī al-Rifī, 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 Mawlāy 'Abd Allāh, the successor of Mawlāy 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, 1844 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 Isly.

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 Rabāt 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 Tanger*" 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 Kampffmeyer. These texts besides their linguistic interest contain valuable information about society and native life in Tangier.

(E. LÉVI-PROVENÇAL)

TANKA, (Sanskrit *ṭaṅka*, a weight of silver = 4 māṣas): an Indian coin. When Maḥmūd of Ghazna conquered northwestern India and struck bilingual coins for the convenience of his Hindu subjects, ṭaṅka was used in the Nāgarī legend as the translation of *dirham* in the Arabic legend. Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish, Sultān of Dehli (1210—1235 = 607—633) introduced a heavy silver coin of 175 grains (= 11.3 grammes) and gave it the name of tanka (although *tola* would have been more accurate); a gold tanka of the same weight was first introduced by Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd (1246—1265 = 646—664). These two coins were henceforth to be the standard coins of India. The gold tanka was last struck by Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥarak (1421—1433 = 824—837) except for a few rare pieces of the Sūris. The coin itself was again struck by Akbar but was now known as the *muhur* [q. v.]. The silver tanka became gradually debased after the reign of Muḥammad b. Tughlak, being practically copper ("black tanka") under the Lōdis. In the great reform of the coinage by Sher Shāh (1539—1545 = 946—952) it was restored to its original fineness and weight but was now called the rupee (*rūpiya*). As the rupee, the denomination was taken over by Akbar and has continued the monetary unit of India to the present day. Akbar transferred the name tanka to copper coinage; his tanka was a piece of 2 dāms (640 grains = 41.5 grammes); he also struck a copper coin called the *tankī* which was 1/10 of a tanka (64 grains = 4.15 grammes).

Silver and more rarely gold tankas were also the currency of the various contemporaries of the Sultāns of Dehli, in Bengal, Guḍjarat, Malwa and the Deccan. The word still survives in Bengālī in the form *ṭakā* and is the regular Bengālī word for the rupee; in Southern India the name is still in use on the Portuguese coins of Goa where it is the equivalent of anna.

Bibliography: E. Thomas, *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Dehli*, London 1871; S. Lane-Poole, *Catalogue of Coins of the Sultans of Dehli in the British Museum*, London 1883, p. xix—xxvii. (J. ALLAN)

TANRI (T.), Heaven; God. In the eastern dialects the vocalisation is usually palatal: Čaghatāi, *tāngri* (written تينگری) and similar forms in the other dialects. The trisyllabic forms in Teleut (*tāñārä*) and in the Altai dialect (*tāñāri*) are worthy of note; the Kasan dialect has alongside of *tāngri* (god) a word *tāri* = image of a saint, ikon (we may here mention the proper name *Tāri-birdi*, where *tāri* of course means God). Ottoman Turkish has a non-palatal vocalisation (*tañrī*) as has Yakutic which has also in addition a trisyllabic form (*tañara*).

For the lexicographical material cf. Pavet de Courteille, *Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental*, s. v.; W. Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-dialekte*, iii. 823, 1043 sq., 1047 sq., 1065; O. Böhtlingk, *Über die Sprache der Jakuten: Jakutisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, p. 90; H. Vámbéry, *Ety-mologisches Wörterbuch der Turko-Tatarischen Sprachen*, p. 168 sq.; and lastly al-Kāshgharī (*Diwān Lughāt al-Turk*, Constantinople 1333—1335, iii. 278 sq.), who says: "*tāngri* means God; the infidels however call heaven *tāngri* and likewise everything that impresses them, e. g. a high mountain or a large tree. They worship such things

and they call a wise man *tängrikän*". This word *tängrikän* appears also as an old Turkī title (cf. Radloff, *Wörterbuch*, iii. 1048; F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica*, p. 47: *tängrikän* = ruler). With the meaning "God" (in the Manichæan system) we find *tängrikän* for example in the Manichæan confession of sins (*Chuastuanist*, 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, *Uigurica*, p. 48, who compares the modern usage of *khanım* and *bēgam*). We may here give a few derivatives of *tängri*: *tängriçi* (in the Manichæan confession of sins, cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1912, p. 289, 299) = preacher, chosen one (lit. man of God); Kuman, *teñrilik* = "divine"; Uigur, *tengrilik* = "pious". The Mongol *tägri* (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 *tängri* 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 *tāñri*, e. g. *tāñri dewedjeyi* = thousand-footed, cf. the Dictionaries of Radloff and Barbier de Meynard (s. v.).

To define the conceptions implied by the word *tängri* 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 *tāñri* almost always appears as a divine power: it is by his will that the king attains to power; the king himself is "like *tāñri*" and "born of *tāñri*" (*tāñritäg tāñridä bolmısh*) and installed by *tāñri* (*tāñri yaratmısh*). *Tāñri* 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 tāñrisi*. 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 *Tāñri*.

There are however some passages where the term *tāñri* does not imply any real personality. The "blue heaven above" (*özä kök tāñri*) is created like the "dark earth below" (*asra yaghız 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 Oghuz 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 prepared lived within the area of Chinese cultural influences.

On the conception of *tāñri* 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 Kaira 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 *Tänärä* and Altai *Tänäri*. Kaira Kan must be identical with the Altai *Kairakkan* (cf. Radloff, *Wörterbuch*, ii. 22), a word used to describe gods and spirits; Tengere Kaira 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 Ülgön, 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 Altaic myth (Radloff, *ibid.*, i. 61 sqq.) a hero seeks the hand of the daughter of the god of heaven, Tāmān Ökō.

When it is said of the thunderstorm in the dialect of Kasan: "The old man of the heavens (*tāñri 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 *Tāñri* 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 *tängri* 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 *kök* (Ottoman *gök*) was used, which is originally the name of a colour (cf. Radloff, *Wörterbuch*, ii. 1220). In old Turkish we also find *kök kalık*, the blue ether (*Uigurica*, 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 khatun*; *tängri kış* is Turkish for *devakanyā* (divine maiden, apsaras). The king of the gods (*devarādja*) Indra

is *tängrilär iliki Khormuzda*; Brahmā is called *Azrua tängrī*. These beings have thus Iranian names, Ohrmazd and (perhaps) Zarwān. The goddess Çri is called *Kut Tängri Khatun* or (without *Khatun*) *Kut Tängri*. The name *Kut Tängri* seems also to be given to Kubera (c. g. Müller, *Uigurica*, p. 45). In a collection of dhāraṇīs for travellers, the *Ṭiṣastvustik* (ed. by W. Radloff and A. v. Staël-Holstein, St. Petersburg 1910 = *Bibl. Buddhica*, xii.), we find a *deva* named *Tängridäm*, whom Radloff takes for Kubera so that the latter has therefore another Turkish name. But this is doubtful, for in one passage (p. 22) of this work, Kubera (*Kupiri*) is mentioned by name and *Tängridäm* 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 *Tängri Tängri*. The god of heaven (*devaloka*) is called in Turkish *Tängri Yir* and the *Vaimānika* gods, as a rule peculiar to Jaina mythology, but also found e. g. in the *Ṭiṣastvastile*, are called *Waimanuki-tängrilär*.

The Manichæan Turkish terminology which is influenced by Buddhist (cf. *Chuastuanift*, ed. A. v. Le Coq, Berlin 1911, p. 5; *J. R. A. S.*, 1911, p. 278) shows the word in the following use: *Tängri* corresponds here to the Iranian *Yazd* (or *Bag*); in the first place this means the highest principle of the Manichæan system and secondly the subordinate spirits of light or gods (*yaruk tängrilär*) in contrast to the demons (*yäklär*). The first man is called *bish tängrī*, five-god (from his five components known from the Manichæan myth: ether, wind, light, water and fire). The name *tängri* is also given to the five elements, e. g. *oot tängrī* = god of fire. *Tängri* is found with the meaning "heaven" (e. g. *Chuastuanift*, p. 16 = *J. R. A. S.*, 1911, p. 291, l. 167). Paradise is called *Tängri Yir*. This Manichæan terminology corresponds pretty well to the Buddhist. One or two peculiarities may still be pointed out: the occurrence of the already mentioned term, *tängrikän* (*Chuastuanift*, p. 10; *J. R. A. S.*, 1911, p. 281, l. 22), in the name of a deity (*Azrua Tängrikän*) translated by von le Coq (*J. R. A. S.*, *loc. cit.*) "Azrua the Lord" and the peculiar combination *Arkhon Yir Tängri*, the "archon earth-god", in which perhaps the word *tängri* is used for one of the powers of darkness (cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1911, p. 303, note 31).

In Christian Turkish usage is *Tängri* = God; *Tängri-Oghlī* = "Son of God" and *Mshikha Tängri* = the God Messiah. In the Christian fragments published by F. W. K. Müller in *Uigurica* we also have the word *Tängridäm*, which we frequently find in Buddhist Turkish; 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 Eastern Turkish texts, the Arabic and Persian terms (*Allāh*, *Khudā*) naturally begin to compete with the Turkish *Tängri*. In the *Kudatku Bilik*, 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 conveyed by *Tängri* in this text but other Turkish words e. g. *Bayat* are used. The word *Tängri* occurs here also with the addition of *ta'ālā*. In the *Bābar-*

nāma *Tängri* seems to be the usual word for the Deity, except in quotations; here also, following the Arabic usage, we sometimes find *Tängri ta'ālā* (e. g. p. 408, ed. Ilminsky). That the word *Tängri* is disappearing in Eastern Turkish also before Arabic and Persian terms is perhaps to be deduced from Shaw's remark (*A Sketch of the Turkish Language*, ii. 69).

Proper names like *Tängribirdi*, *Tängrikull* may be modelled on Persian names like *Khudādā* and *Khadābanda*. (V. F. BÜCHNER).

TĀNSĪN, of whom Shaikh Abu 'l-Faḍl said: "A singer like him has not been in India for a thousand years", was a native of Gwāliyār, and was at first in the service of Rām Čand the Baghela, Rādjā of Pannā, who is said to have given him on one occasion ten million *tankas*. Ibrāhīm Sūr vainly endeavoured to entice him to Āgra, but Akbar, in 1562, sent a mission to Rām Čand at Kālijār to induce Tānsin to come to his court, and Rām Čand, not daring to refuse the request, sent him with his musical instruments and many presents to the imperial court. On the first occasion of his performing there Akbar gave him 200,000 rupees. Most of his compositions are written in Akbar's name, and his melodies are still popular in Hindūstān. He had two sons, Tāntarang Khān, also a singer at Akbar's court, and Bilās, whose son-in-law, Lāl Khān, was one of the best singers at the court of Shāh Djahān. Gwāliyār was famous for its musicians, and produced no fewer than eleven of the eighteen singers at Akbar's court.

Bibliography: Shaikh Abu 'l-Faḍl, *Akbar-nāma*, text and translation by H. Beveridge; *Ā'in-i Akbarī*, text and translation by Blochmann and Jarrett; 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Lāhawī, *Pādshāh-nāma*, text; all in the Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

(T. W. HAIG)

TANTA, an important town in the Egyptian Delta between the Rosetta and Damietta branches of the Nile, capital of the Gharbiya province, and a busy railway junction, of unprepossessing appearance, about 75 miles from Alexandria. Its Coptic name of TANTAΘO has assumed in Arabic the forms Tanditā, Tāntā and Tāntā. Formerly it was an episcopal city. Nowadays the place is famous for the tomb and mosque of the most celebrated of the Muslim saints in Egypt, Aḥmad al-Badawī [q. v.]. Throughout the year no fewer than three *Mawālīd* or birthdays of this Saint are made the occasion of great fairs to which pilgrims flock from all parts. The presence of a large native population and the extreme veneration with which the spot is regarded have made it a centre of fanaticism. Tāntā is one of those places where the worship of a Muslim Saint had displaced that of an earlier Coptic one.

The present town is built on one of those numerous mounds of accumulated mud-hut debris so characteristic a feature of the Egyptian landscape. The Aḥmadiya mosque, which was rebuilt under 'Abbās I, is the principal building of any historic importance. It is now the second largest religious establishment in the country. A library, begun in 1898, contains about 9,000 volumes including over 1,000 MSS. The number of professors attached to the Tāntā institute is over 100; the

TARIM, local (Turkish) pronunciation *Terim*, the principal river of modern Chinese Turkistān (length about 1,200 miles). It is probably the Oikhardēs of Ptolemy (vi. 16). In the first (seventh) century the river is mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuan-Āng (Hiouen-Thsang, *Mémoires*, transl. Stan Julien, ii. 220) under the name Si-to (Sanskrit Sītā). In the fifth (xith) century Maḥmūd Kāshgharī (i. 116) mentions the river Usmī Tarim "which flows out of the land of Islām into the land of the Uighurs and loses itself in the sand there". According to the same source (*op. cit.*, p. 332), Usmī-Tarim was a place near Kučā 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 Turkistān, Yārkaṇḍ Daryā. The source of the Yārkaṇḍ-Daryā is the Raskem-Daryā which lies in the mountains of Karakorum on the frontier of India. In the history of Timūr (*Zafar-nāma*, Calcutta 1887—1888, ii. 219), a place called Tarim is mentioned not far from Bāi and Kūsan (Kučā). Tarim appears also in the *Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* of Muḥammad Ḥaidar (transl. E. D. Ross, p. 67) as the name of a district, along with Turfān, Lob and Katak; the name of the river is not mentioned in these sources. According to the *Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* (*op. cit.*, p. 11), the town of Lob-Katak (or the towns of Lob and Katak) was destroyed by a sandstorm in the vijith (xivth) century. As Sven Hedin (*Through Asia*, London 1898, p. 850) has ascertained, legends about the destroyed town of Katak ("*Shahr-i-Kōttek* or else *Shahr-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 Ketek-Tarim (Kornilow, *Kashgariya*, Tashkent 1903, p. 164). In the time of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī, Islām 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 Muḥammadans by Marco Polo (Ch. 57).

The Yārkaṇḍ-Daryā leaves the mountains and enters the plain at the village of Qarčun and receives on the left bank the Kizil-Su or Kāshghar-Daryā, the Aksu or Aksu-Daryā, the Muzart or Shāh-Yār-Daryā and the Konče-Daryā, on the right the Tiznab, the Khatan-Daryā and the Kerya-Daryā. The right hand tributaries only reach the Tarim when they are flooded. Below the mouth of the Aksu the Tarim is about 400 yards broad; in this region it is divided into several arms; the principal arm, the Ugen-Daryā, 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 Čerčen-Daryā also flows; the Su-liho also flows into it from the east. Lop (or Lob), according to Sven Hedin (*Through Asia*, p. 871), is now the name applied to the whole region from the mouth of the Ugen-Daryā and the Tarim in the north to the village of Čarkhlik (south of Čerčen-Daryā) 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 Lop-nor and Tarim-gol (gol, Mongol: river; the latter on the map by J. Klaproth of 1829) 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 conditions and the 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 (*Loplik*) catch fish in special boats. Sven Hedin explored the region of Lob-nor in one such boat; there has never been any navigation in the proper sense on the Tarim. As in the time of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī, the river was swallowed up by the desert before it reached the bed of the lake; the fishing village of Kum-čapghan is described by Hedin (*op. cit.*, p. 884) as "the entrance to the tomb of the Tarim".

Bibliography: A particularly full account of the most important sources is given in Kornilow, *Kashgariya*, Tashkent 1903, p. 157 sqq., from his own researches and the narration of Przewalski, Hedin, Pievtzow, Kozlow etc.

(W. BARTHOLD)

TARĪM, i. an old town and still one of the most important in northern Ḥaḍramōt, on the left side of the main wādī which traverses the whole of Ḥaḍramōt and is called Wādī Masile east of Shibām or Wādī Ḥaḍramōt or simply al-Wādī; others distinguish Wādī Masile and Wādī Ḥaḍramōt, but are not agreed on the position of the confluence of the two (cf. Stieler's map 60 in his *Hundatlas*⁹ [Gotha 1905] and the *Map of Hadramut* [surveyed by Imam Sharif Khan Bahadur] in Th. Bent, *Southern Arabia*, London 1900, p. 70). The statements of the Arab geographers regarding Ḥaḍramōt, especially the interior (already in part utilised by Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xii. [Berlin 1846], passim and brought together in a critical survey based on all texts, so far accessible, by M. de Goeje, *Hadhramaut*, *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 Shibām and Tarīm as two (principal) towns in Ḥaḍramōt, without further defining their situation, e.g. Yāqūt, *Mu'jam*, ii. 284; iii. 247; i. 746; al-Idrisī (see Jaubert, *Géographie d'Édrisi* [Paris 1836], p. 149 sq. and 53) and others (see below). Al-Ḥamdānī, *Djazira*, p. 87, calls Tarīm a large town (as he does the Tarīs northeast of Shibām), Shibām the great capital (p. 86) Of no importance are the mere references as in al-Ḥamdānī, p. 177 (along with Tarīs) etc., or references in poets in al-Ḥamdānī, p. 182; al-Bakrī, p. 107, 184 etc. K. Niebuhr, as early as 1763 (see his *Beschreibung von Arabien* [Copenhagen 1772], p. 286 sqq.) received in Ṣan'ā' and Maskat from Arab stories of the existence of Tarīm and Shibām (on p. 286 the mention of "these two most prominent towns of Ḥaḍramōt" is quoted from the *Geographia*

simplification of vowel sounds ($\delta > a$) and by the aspirated character of certain consonants.

The Tāts of the Caucasus are at the present day entirely surrounded by Turkish and Daghestānian 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 out-thrust 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 Tāt remains of ancient colonies transplanted to Daghestān in the period when the Sāsānians were fortifying Darband. According to Balādhurī, p. 194, Anūshirwān (531—579) had settled the region of Darband-Shābirān [cf. SHIRWĀN] with people from Sisakan (*al-siyāsīdjīn*). This last province was situated on the left bank of the Araxes (practically the district of Nakhčuwān with the surrounding mountains) immediately north of Ādharbāidjān. 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 Sāsānian king to detach their province from Armenia and include it in Ādharbāidjān; cf. Marquart, *Ēransāhr*, p. 120—122, Hübschmann, *Die altarmen. 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*, vi., St. Petersburg 1851, p. 461, says. Anūshirwān peopled the new towns in the vicinity of Darband with people from Ādharbāidjān and Fārs and the towns to the south of Darband (the region of Shābaran-Mashkūr; cf. the word KUBBA) with people from the 'Irāk and Fārs. According to the same source (p. 530) however, the fortresses around Darband were re-built under the 'Abbāsīd al-Manšūr (754—775) and on this occasion Arabs from Mawšil and Syria were placed in them. Among the places fortified are especially mentioned Muṭā'ī, Kamākhī, etc. which at the present day are inhabited by Tāts. It might be concluded from this that the presence of Tāts at Muṭā'ī etc. represents a migration later than the eighth century, but the text of the *Darband-nāma*, 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 Klaproth's version, three hundred families settled in Muṭā'ī came from Tabasaran!). The historical sources at our disposal thus only reveal the ethnical complexity of the colonies established in Darband. On the other hand, Tātī in its general characteristics is a modern dialect which (apart from rhotacism) does not show any special traces of antiquity such as might be expected if it had long been isolated. The question of the Tātī Jewish dialect is only a subsidiary one, the Jews even if they had been in Daghestān before the coming of the Tāts (cf. Miller, 1892, Introduction) may have adopted Tātī in place of their old language (Arabic?).

As to the affinities of Tātī the rhotacism of its dialects has analogies in the Iranian islands of Persian Ādharbāidjān at the present day. For the region of Ardabil, we have examples from the xivth century (Ahmad Kisrawī *Ādharī*, *Zabān-i būstān-i Ādharbāidjān*, Tīhrān, 1304 [1927]). The early borrowings made by Armenian from

Iranian (*Mar* < *Māda*; *sparapel* < *spūdapat*) also suggest the existence at a very early date of this peculiarity among the Iranian neighbours of the Armenians (Marquart, *Ēransāhr*, 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 Lāhidj inhabited by Tāts (at the sources of the Gök-čai) and perhaps mentioned in the Georgian *Chronicle*, Brosset, I, p. 364, under the year 1120 (Lidatha or Laidjk). The inhabitants themselves believe they came from Lāhidjān [q. v.]. The investigation conducted on the spot by V. F. Miller in 1928 has shown that the dialect of Lāhidj has certain special features. It is possible that some colonies of Tāts 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 *Gulistān-i Irān*, of Bākī-Khanov, Bākū 1928, p. 14, the people of Miskindja in the district of Samur came from Astrābād in the time of Tahmāsp I).

Bibliography: Bérézine, *Recherches sur les dial. persans*, Kazan 1853, p. 2—24 (grammar of Tātī); on Dorn's Materials see his *Caspīi*, Russian edition, St. Petersburg 1875, p. xli. 203, 353, 493 and especially Miller, 1907 (quoted below); Vsevolod F. Miller, *Materiali dlia izučeniya yewreisko-tatskago yazıka*, St. Petersburg 1892 (bibliography [30 articles in Russian], introduction, text [8 histories], vocabulary); *Armiano-tatskiye teksti*, *Sbornik materialov dlia opisaniya Kawkaza*, Tiflis 1894, vol. xx./2, p. 25—32; Geiger, *Die kaspischen Dialecte*, *Grund. d. iran. Phil.*, i./2, p. 345—373 (passim; very meagre); V. F. Miller, *Očerki fonetiki yewr.-tat. narčciya*, *Trudi po vostok. Lazar. Instituta*, fasc. iii., Moscow 1900; do., *Očerki morfologii yewr.-tat. narčc.*, *ibid.*, fasc. vii., 1901; do., *Tatskiye etüdi*, part i., *ibid.*, fasc. xxiv., 1905 (p. 1—29: 11 histories in the dialect of the Muslim Tats of Lāhidj; p. 33—79: Tātī-Russian vocabulary); part ii., *ibid.*, fasc. xxvi., 1907 (grammar); do., *Yewr.-tat. ma'ni*, *Zap.*, 1913, xxi., fasc. iv., 0017—0029; Korsch, *Slėd'i dialect. rhotacisma v srednepers. yazıke*, *Drevnosti vostoč.*, ii./3, Moscow 1903, p. 1—10. On the Tats of the Caucasus cf. Erckert, *Der Kaukasus und seine Völker*, Leipzig 1887, p. 220; Kowalewski, *O yuridičeskom bit'e Tatov*, *Izvestiya Obsšč. Ljubit. Yestestvoznaniya*, Moscow 1888, xlii., fasc. 2, p. 42—9. On Lāhidj cf. Mamed-Hasan Efendiew, in *Sborn. mater.*, xxix., Tiflis. — On the mountain Jews cf. Miller's bibliography and H. Rosenthal in *Jewish Encyclop.*, iii., 1902, p. 628—631; Kurdov, *Gorskiye yewrei Daghestana*, *Russ. antropol. journal*, Moscow 1905, fasc. 3 and 4, p. 57—88; do., *Gorks. yewrei Shemakh uyezda*, *ibid.*, 1912, fasc. 2 and 3, p. 87—100; do., *Tat'i Daghestana*, *ibid.*, 1907, fasc. 3—4, p. 56—66 (the author shows that from the anthropological point of view the Tats of the 7 villages west of Darband, are very different from the Tats of Bākū and from the Persian, and more closely related to the Turks). (V. MINORSKY)

TATAR, written Tātār, Tatār 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'Orkhon, Helsingfors 1896, 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 Thomsen, these Tatars lived southwest of Baikal roughly as far as Kerulen. With the foundation of the empire of the Kitai [see *KARA KHITAI*] the Turks were driven out of modern Mongolia and Mongol tribes took their place. The district of Ütükan, continually mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions as the dwelling-place of the Turks, lay, according to Maḥmūd Kaṣḥghārī (i. 123) in his time (second half of the vth = xth century), in the land of the Tatars. That the language of the Tatars was different from Turkish was known to Maḥmūd Kaṣḥghārī (*op. cit.*, i. 30). A number of Tatar clans had joined with Turkish peoples and moved farther westwards. In the anonymous *Hudūd al-'Ālam* (cf. *Zap.*, x. 121 sqq.) the Tatars are described as a part of the Tughuzghuz [cf. *GHUZZ*] (cf. W. Barthold, *Otčet o poiezdkie v Srednyuyu Aziyu*, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 34), by Gardizī (*op. cit.*, p. 82 sq.) as part of the Kimāk [q.v.] on the Irtysh [q.v.]. In the anonymous *Mudjmil al-Tawārīkh* (c. 520 = 1126), in the list of titles of rulers (in Barthold, *Turkestan*, i. 20), is given a Tatar ruler *Simūn buyūy* (or *biwi*?) *djayūr*, nowhere else mentioned. In the reports of the campaigns of Sulṭān Muḥammad b. Takash [see *KHWĀRIZM-SHĀH*] against the Kipčak [q.v.] is mentioned a campaign by him in 615 (1218-1219) against Kadīr Khān, son of the Tatar Yūsuf (*Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, transl. Raverty, 1881, i. 267).

In the accounts of the Mongol conquests of the viith (xiiith) century the conquerors are everywhere (in China, in the Muslim world, in Russia and Western Europe) called Tatars (Chin. *Ta-ta*); the same name is given in Ibn al-Athīr (ed. Tornberg, xii. 178 sq., 236 sq.) to the predecessors of Čingiz Khān, the Naiman under Küčlük [see *KARA KHITAI*]; according to Ibn al-Athīr (*op. cit.*, p. 237), these were the "first Tatars" (*al-Tatar al-ūlā*). Rashīd al-Dīn, 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 Čingiz Khān many of the people subdued by him had, says Rashīd al-Dīn, adopted the name "Moghūl" (Mongol); the Tatars previously had been equally powerful; many peoples had been so called; therefore "in Khitai, Hindūstān, Čin, Māčin, among the Kirghiz, in Kelār (Poland), Bāshkird (Hungary), in the steppes (*dashūt*) 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 Tātār" (text in *Trud. Vost. Otd. Arkh. Obsč.*, vii. 64).

The peoples of Mongol origin and language had apparently always called themselves Tatar. After the time of Čingiz Khān, this word was completely supplanted in Mongolia and Central Asia by the word "Mongol" (in Muslim manuscripts *Moghūl* or *Moghūl* and in the every day language of the descendants of the Mongols in Afghānistān, who have kept their language to the present day, *Moghūl*), officially introduced by Čingiz Khān. 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 Pian de Carpini and William of Rubruck; *Habl. Soc.*, 1905, Index s.v. Mongol and Tartar). The people of the kingdom of the Golden Horde [see *BĀTU KHĀN* and *BERKE*] 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 Tīmūr's campaign they were leading a nomadic life in the country between Amasia [q.v.] and Kaišariya [q.v.]; they numbered 30-40,000 families (*Zafar-nāma*, Ind. edition, Calcutta 1888, ii., p. 502 sq.). Tīmūr had these "Tatars" deported to Central Asia, according to Ibn 'Arabshāh (ed. Manger, ii. 338), on the advice of Sulṭān Bāyazid; there they were allotted dwelling-places in Kaṣḥghār on an island (which now no longer exists) in Lake Issik-Kul [q.v.] and in Khwārizm; a section of them succeeded in escaping to the lands of the Golden Horde. After Tīmūr'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, *GOR*², 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 (*spisok*) 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 Kasimow [q.v.] and the Tatars of Tobolsk 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 Islām. 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 Noghai stock. In the central course of the Volga also the "Tatars" are usually given this name by their Christian fellow-countrymen, the "Kryashen" (from the Russian *kresčeny* "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 for 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. I.*, 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 (*očerk*) by Prof. D. Zolotarev in the book of travels *Povolžye*, 1926, p. 99 sqq. (the figures are given on p. 123 and 126).

Bibliography: given in the article.

(W. BARTHOLD)

TATĪL a technical term used in dogmatics meaning the divesting of the conception of God of all attributes; see the article TASHBĪH.

TAWADDUD, 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 *Tamannī*, *Tadjannī* 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 Hārūn to free him from his difficulties. Hārūn 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 Ibrāhīm b. Saiyār al-Nazzām, 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 Nazzām 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-Nazzām (d. 231 = 845—846), preserved in all versions even the Shi'a and Christian forms (see below), gives a *terminus post quem*, while the oldest Spanish version going back probably to the xiiith century gives a lower limit; but we shall hardly have to go beyond the xth or xith 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 his 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 Parsis, in the Christian east and European middle ages and in Arabic literature also. The Arabic books of questions are sometimes like the *Kitāb al-Tarbi' wa 'l-Tadwīr* of Djāhīz intelligible only to the learned, sometimes for popular instruction like the questions of 'Abd Allāh b. Salām, which have passed into other Muslim literatures. Tawaddud belongs to the latter group although the theological in the didactic part of the story is by no means so predominant as in the questions of 'Abd Allāh. A Shi'a version of Tawaddud is found in the *Hasanīya* of Abu 'l-Futuwwa popular in Persia in Malcolm's time.

A Christian version is the Spanish *Historia della donzella Theodor*, of which we still possess

an older form free from the Christian insertions of the later. The *Historia della donzella Theodor* — the manuscript in Madrid of the *Hikāyat al-Djāriya Tūdūr* 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.

Bibliography: Chauvin, *Bibliographie*, vii. 117 sq.; Horovitz, in *Z.D.M.G.*, lvii. 173 sqq.; Menendez, in *Homenaje Codera*, p. 483 sqq.; W. Suchier, *L'enfant sage* (*Gesellschaft für romanische Litteratur*, vol. XXIV); G. Heinrici, *Griechisch-byzantinische Gesprächsbücher* (*Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, XXVIII); G. F. Pijper, *Het boek der duizend vragen*, Leyden 1924.

(J. HOROVITZ)

TAWĀF (A.) from *fāsa* 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. especially Ps. xxvi. 6 (xxvii. 6, lxx.) and 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 *dawār* (from *dāra*) also used. Thus Imru 'l-Kais, *Mu'allaka*, 63, compares the wild cows with young women in long trailing robes, who perform the circumambulation (*duwār*, a circumambulated idol like *dawār* in 'Antara 10, 2, if *diwār* 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 Muḥammad adopted this old custom when he established the rites of his religion and centred them round the Ka'ba. When, in the year 8, he made his victorious entry into his native town, he is said by Ibn Hishām, p. 820 and Tabarī, i. 1642 to have performed the *ṭawāf* riding on his camel, touching with his crooked staff the *rukn* (the eastern corner of the Ka'ba where the stone was). This was however something exceptional and according to Ibn Hishām, 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 Hishām, p. 51, 20) 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 during 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 *ṭawāf* which previously took place only at the *'umra* [q. v.] was inserted by Muḥammad in the great *ḥajj* when the pilgrims visited Mecca. This suggestion is however disputed, cf. HADJDI, ii., p. 199^a where Sūra iii. 91 is quoted against it, but the expression *ḥajj al-bait* 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. Pharmakidis, *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 Shawwāl 937 (May 1351; cf. Pharmakidis, p. 310 *sqq.*), while the other, Idris Beg, made a name in his day as a poet and excellent translator of Hātifi's *Khosrew u-Shirīn* and *Lailā u-Mudjnūn* into Turkish (cf. Sehi, *Tedhkire*, p. 36 *sq.*). The family of Turakhān-oghlu, which was established around Larisa and owned extensive estates until quite modern times, later played no important part in history. A certain Fā'ik Pasha, recorded as a late descendant of Turakhān Beg, by his extortions as governor of Rūm-eli made his name hated; he was beheaded in the court of the Serai in Stambul at the age of 70 in March 1643 (cf. J. von Hammer, *G. O. R.*, p. 322 from Na'imā, and Zinkeisen, *G. O. R.*, iv. 535). J. Ph. Fallmerayer in 1842 saw "at the chief mosque [of Larisa] a biography of Turchan-Beg preserved there" (cf. *Fragmente aus dem Orient*², 1877, p. 381 *sqq.*) but this seems to have since disappeared (like the MS. biography of the Ewrenos-oghlu [q. v.] mentioned by Beaujour, *Tableau du commerce de la Grèce*, 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. Urquhart, *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 Tyrnacos in Thessaly. (F. BABINGER)

TÜRĀN (or Ṭawārān?), the old name of a district in Balūčistān.

According to Ṭabarī, i. 820, the kings of Ṭūrān and of Makurān (Mukrān) submitted to the Sāsānian Ardāshīr (224—241). The Paikulī inscription only mentions the Makurān-shāh. Herzfeld, *Paikulī*, p. 38, thinks that these princes at first owned the suzerainty of the Sakas and their submission to Ardāshīr was the result of the conquest of Sakastān (= Sistān) by this monarch.

Balādhurī does not mention al-Ṭūrān. According to one of his sources, Ḥadjdjādī [q. v.] appointed Sa'īd b. Aslam to Mukrān and "(all) that frontier". Ištakhri, p. 171, and Ibn Ḥawqal, p. 226, among the inhabited places in Ṭūrān mention Mḥālī (?), Kīzkānān, Sūra (Shūra) and Kuṣdār (or Kuṣdār). Ibn Ḥawqal, p. 232, says that Ṭūrān is a valley with a fortified town (*kaṣaba*) also called al-Ṭūrān and in its centre is a fortress (*hiṣn*) commanded by an ignorant Baṣrian. Ibn Ḥawqal, p. 232—233, mentions Kuṣdār separately from the *kaṣaba* of the same name. Kuṣdār was the town (commercial?) of Ṭūrān possessing "a district and several towns". A certain Muḡhīr (or Mu'īn b. Aḥmad) had seized Kuṣdār and only recognised the direct authority of the 'Abbāsīd caliph.

The statements in Idrīsī, i. 166, 177, confuse the situation, for he gives the name al-Ṭūbarān to the station in Makurān which Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 55, calls al-Ṭābarān [ten farsakhs S. E. of Fāhrādj, on the river which is now called Sarbāz and flows

into the sea near Gwattar], but then associates Kuṣdār and Kīzkānān (towns in the district of Ṭūrān!) with this Ṭūbarān. On the other hand, he places Ṭūrān 4 days' journey from Kuṣdār, in the direction of Mastundj, i.e. to the north. As the site of Kuṣdār [q. v.] is known (85 miles S. of Kalāt at a height of 4,050 feet: cf. the article BALŪČISTĀN), Ṭūrān (the town) must be located at Kalāt.

The town of Kāndābil, five farsakhs (more accurately 5 *marḥal*) from Kuṣdār, is outside of Ṭūrān and is the capital of the district of the Budhas (Balādhurī, p. 436: Zuṭṭ al-Budha). Kāndābil, lying in the plain, is identified with Gandāwa (75 English miles N.E. of Khozdar, to the north of the Indus, at a height of 314 feet above sea-level).

The position of Kīzkānān, the residence of the already mentioned Mu'īn b. Aḥmad (chief of Ṭūrān according to Ištakhri, or of Kuṣdār, according to Ibn Ḥawqal), is unknown. Marquart, *op. cit.*, p. 192, 275—276, connects Kīzkānān with Kīkān (cf. Balādhurī, p. 432) and seeks it at Kalāt. In this case, Kīzkānān = the *kaṣaba* al-Ṭūrān. The land between Kīzkānān and Kāndābil, inhabited by Budhas and possessing vines, bore the name of its chief Ayl (or Utl [?]).

Yākūt, iii. 557, reckons Ṭūrān (the *kaṣaba* of which is Kuṣdār and which has several *rustāḳ*) among the *nāḥiya* of Sind. He also mentions a *nāḥiya* of Ṭūrān in Madā'in and a village of Ṭūrān belonging to Harāt.

The Arabs write Turan with *t* which may represent some local aspiration of *ṭ*. In principle there is nothing to object to in the connection of Ṭūrān with Tūrān but it would be unwise to go beyond stating the similarity of the names. The connection is still weaker if we connect Ṭūrān with Ṭūbarān and Ṭabarān.

Bibliography: Tomaschek, *Zur hist. Topogr. Persiens*, i. 56, thinks the name Ṭūrān may come from the Iranian term Tūra, which means "enemy, non-Iranian countries"; Marquart, *Erānshahr*, p. 31—33, 187, 190; Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p. 332; Hüsing, *Völkerschichten in Iran, Mitt. d. Anthropol. Gesell. Wien*, xxxvi., 1916, p. 200, seeks the real Tūrān not in Turkeṣtān but in Ṭūrān of Kuṣdār (inhabited by the ancestors of the Brahūi of our day!). (V. MINORSKY)

TÜRĀN, 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 (Pāpakān) and the names of countries (Gēlān, Dailamān) (cf. *Grundr. d. iran. Phil.*, 1/ii., p. 176; Salemann, *ibid.*, 1/i., p. 280 expresses doubts as to whether *-ān* is from the genitive plural *-ānām*).

Three questions are raised by the name Tūrān: 1. its origin, 2. its later acceptance, which identifies Tūrān with "the land of the Turks", 3. its modern geographical, linguistic and political applications.

The Tūra. In the Iranian sphere, the element Tūr of Tūr-ān has analogies in the Avestan Tūra- (Tura-). In the parts preserved of the Avesta, we have 1. Tūra, the father of two pious individuals, who bear the Iranian names of Arōjahwant and Frārāzi but of whom nothing more is known (*Yasht*, xiii. 113—123); 2. the people called Tūra or Tura, probably nomads (*Yasht*, xvii. 55: *āsu-aspa* "having swift steeds"). [The adjective from Tūra, with epenthesis, is *tūrīya*].

The Tūryans are several times represented as enemies of the Iranians and of the true religion (cf. *Yasht*, xvii. 55 where they pursue Ashi wanuhi). A subdivision (?) of the Tūryans is called Dānu (*Yasht*, xvii. 55—56), which may be connected with the Sanskrit *dānava* "demons". A particularly hateful figure is that of the "Tūryan brigand" Fraṅrasyan (= Afrāsiyāb), whose fruitless attempts to seize the royal power (*xvarəna*) are related at length in *Yasht*, xix. 56—64. But the same *Yasht*, xix. 93, admits that the *xvarəna* had once been in the possession of Fraṅrasyan, when he played the part of defender of Iran against the tyrant Zainigav. The hostility to Fraṅrasyan might therefore have political roots.

Quite a number of passages reveal that there were pious people among the Tūra. The family of the Tūryan Fryāna is particularly praised in a very early passage in the Gāthās (*Yasna*, xlvi. 12). The passage in *Yasht*, xiii. 143 is very well known: "we sacrifice to the *frawashi* of the pious men and the pious women of the Aryan (Iranian), Tūryan, Sairimyan, Sāinyan and Dāhyan lands".

An indirect indication of the abode of the Tūra is given in *Yasht*, v. 57, where the descendants of *Vaēsaka, lieutenant of Fraṅrasyan (*Shāh-nāma*, ed. Vullers, i. 248, 264: Wēsa), are located at the pass of Xšathrō-suka, situated "very high" in Kaṅha (= Bukhārā?; cf. Marquart, *Komanen*, p. 196; in Chinese: Khang = Samarkand). On the other hand, the name of the canton Tur, which the Armenian translator of Ptolemy mentions in Khwārizm (ed. Soukry, § 34; cf. below), is very significant.

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

The term *dānu* (cf. above) may also have a non-ethnical significance and mean the non-Mazdaean Tūra ("demons") [Christensen (1928) 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 Turks dans l'Avesta" supports the popular etymology Tūra = Turk and seeks to explain the names of the Tūryan Dānu, Kara Asabana and Vara Asabana, by the Turkish words *ḡara* "black" and *gör* (?) "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 name Turk (cf. *ürk-türk*, "force, power": F. W. K. Müller, *Uigurica*, ii. 10; *türküm*, "family": Kāshghari, i. 368), the name Tūra is readily explained in Iranian as "courageous", "brave"; cf. *tūr* in Persian and in Kurdish and the significant allusion of Firdawsī to the character of Tūr, son of Farīdūn. It is true that the etymology of Kara and Vara is still obscure and that, ac-

ording to Firdawsī, a member of the Vēsa family bears the name of Kurūkhān (?) (ed. Vullers, i. 261), but alongside these names one could place other Tūryan names of clearly Iranian appearance, including that of the third companion of Kara and of Vara, Dūraēkaēta "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, *Erānsahr*, p. 155—157. According to him, the celebrated ancestral home of the Iranians Airyanəm waējō was in Khwārizm. The legendary wars of Iran and Tūrān reflect the struggles between the settled Iranians (who, proud of their superior culture, had monopolised the name *airyana*) 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 Ptolemy (Ananias of Shirak?) mentions in Khwārizm must be a memory of the Tūra people. [The connection of the district of Tūr with the Bactrian satrapy of *Τουριοία* (Strabo, xi. 517) has still to be settled (cf. Oberhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 194, 202)]. 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-çi, the Kūshāns, the Khīōnites, the Hephthalites and the Turks.

The Sanskrit translation of the *Avesta* renders Tūra by Turuṣkaḡ. This last word seems usually to refer to the Turks, but as 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 *Shāh-nāma*. The connection between the Tūrān and the Tūra was found quite late (cf. Spiegel, *Eranische Alterthumskunde*, 1871, i. 553 and especially Geiger, *op. cit.*, 1822, p. 193). The Middle Persian sources which might retain traces of the evolution of Tūrān from Tūra have had no direct influence on the formation of the current connotation of Tūrān. We can therefore say that the principal source of oriental and European views on this subject has been the *Shāh-nāma*. The parallel Persian and Arabic sources, also based on the Middle Persian *Khwārtay-nāmak*, have served only as a supplement to Firdawsī's poem.

Tūrān is mentioned in the chapter of the *Shāh-nāma* relating to the tripartition of the world by Farīdūn (Thraētaona, Frēdhōn), the last universal monarch (ruler of the clime Xvanīras); cf. Macan's edition p. 58; Mohl, i. 138; Vullers, i. 77—78.

Tūrān and its eponym. *Yasht*, xiii. 143 (cf. above), which is very early, reflects the idea that the world is made up of five nations. On the other hand from the Pahlavi *Dēnkart* we know that an Avestan book, now lost, spoke of the tripartition of the world among the sons of Farīdūn (Thraētaona, Frēdhōn); Sarm, Tūč and Ērēč (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 Farīdūn had to be given, one in the west the

other in the east, apanages in conformity with the political divisions of the period (Sāsānian?). The west was thus identified with Rūm (Byzantine empire) and the east with the Turks, neighbours of the Persians since the defeat of the Hephthalites under Khusraw I (ca. 557).

The ancient legend of the tripartition of the world among the sons of Thraētaona symbolised the relationship of the ancient peoples of whom they were the eponyms. In the time of Firdawsī, the legend was totally deprived of ethnical foundation and the contradictions had to be concealed by playing upon words. In the *Shāh-nāma*, Farīdūn gives his sons the name of Salm, Tūr and Īradj only after subjecting them to a test to reveal their characters. The eldest, who has escaped the danger without scathe (*salāmat*) receives the lands in the west (*Rūm wa-xāwar*) with the title Xāwar-khudāy. To the dashing second son (*tūr* = courageous) is given Tūrān and he becomes Tūrān-shāh, or Shāh-i Ālīn, "lord of the Turks and Chinese" (Türk wa-Ālīn; cf. ed. Vullers, reign of Farīdūn, verses 460 and 295). The youngest, as brave as he is prudent, receives "Īrān and the plain of the heroes" (or perhaps of the Kurds: cf. *ibid.*, verses 291, 300 and 321) with the title *Īrān-khudāy*.

In the Arabic writers (cf. Ṭabarī, i. 226) the name of the eldest son still has the form Sarm < Sairima. But as the Pahlavi alphabet does not distinguish *r* and *l*, Firdawsī (as well as the *Mudjmal al-Tawārīkh*) preferred the variant Salm which lent itself to a play on the Arabic root *s-l-m*. [Modi's attempt: *Asiatic Papers*, Bombay 1905, p. 244, and Blochet's: *Rev. de l'Or. Chrétien*, 1925, xxv., p. 431, to connect Sairima directly with Rome (*sRim, cf. Armen. hRom) is wild in every respect]. That the connection of Salm with the west is still very slight is evident from the fact that the two brothers Salm and Tūr fight east of the Caspian Sea (Tha'ālibī moves the scene of war to Ādharbāidjān) and hold there jointly a naval stronghold Alānān-diž (Dihistānān Šūr, on the Cape of Ḥasan-kuli? on which see Barthold, *K. istorii orosheniya Turkestana*, St. Petersburg 1914, p. 33). The name of the Alāns (ancestors of the Ossetes and descendants of the Sauromates = Sairima?) in these regions can relate only to a period about the first century B.C., when the Iranians still ruled around the Caspian (Marquart, *Komanen*, p. 108).

The name Tūr (Firdawsī and *Mudjmal al-Tawārīkh*) appears in the *Dēnkart*, viii. 13 as Tūč and this form predominates in the Arabic sources: Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 15: Tūdj or Tūs; Dīnawarī, p. 11 (the sons of Nimrūd: Īradj, Salm and Tūs); Ṭabarī, i. 226; *Fihrist*, p. 12; Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, ii. 116; Bīrūnī, *al-Āthār al-bākiya*, p. 102; Tha'ālibī, ed. Zotenberg, p. 41 (Tūz, Tūž). In any case the form Tūr chosen by Firdawsī to explain Tūr-ān as the apanage of the bearer of this name differs from the forms found in the Pahlavi and Arabic sources. According to Marquart, *Beiträge, Z.D.M.G.*, 1895, p. 664—7, Tōč < Taurič (from Tūra); according to Christensen, Tūč is from Tūr + č = "of Tūryan origin".

Tūrān as a geographical term. The term Tūrān, formed from the name of the people Tūra, which is derived from that of its eponym Tūč/Tūr, and ultimately applied to the country of the Turks, ought to be found in the Sāsānian *Khwāṭay-nāmak*, the source used by the Arab

historians and by Firdawsī. It is true that the *Bundahish*, xii. 13, 39, etc. uses only the term Turkestān [while Salmān, "land of Salm" *ibid.* xx. 12, there designates the country from which the Tugra comes] but we find Tūrān in the *Dēnkart* viii, and in the fragments from Turfān (F. W. K. Müller, ii. 87).

For Firdawsī, Tūrān, land of the Turks and of the Chinese, is separated from Īrān by the Oxus (*Shāh-nāma*, ed. Vullers, reign of Farīdūn, verses 295, 309, 322, 456, 459, 542, 792, reign of Nawdhār verse 133; ed. Mohl, v. 680, reign of Bahrām Gūr). On the other hand in the account of the defeat of Afrāsiyāb, the beginning of his domains seems to be extended to "Kibčak". Marquart, *Komanen*, p. 110, from the manuscripts, emends this name to Kočkār (*bāshī*) and identifies it with the encampment of the Karlukh [q. v.] 5 farsakhs beyond Tarāz [q. v.]; cf. Ibn Khurdādhbih, p. 24: *Kšry bās*. In the same way the capital of Afrāsiyāb, Kang-diz, is located by Firdawsī somewhere near China, without any connection with the country of Kang (Bukhārā) (ed. Vullers, verse 1381; cf. Bartholomae, col. 437; Marquart, *Komanen*, 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 Tūrān, Firdawsī may have substituted their name for that of the old Avestan people Sānav, already assimilated to the Chinese in the *Bundahish* (Darmesteter, *Le Zend Avesta*, ii. 554).

The Muslim writers, Arabic, Persian and Turkish, have not been logical in the use of the term Tūrān. But since for the Arab geographers, the land of the Turks began only to the east of the Sīr Daryā and did not include Transoxiana (cf. Barthold, *Turkestan, Gibb. Mem. Ser.*, p. 64), it seems that there was a tendency to identify Tūrān with Transoxiana, i. e. with the lands between the Amū-Daryā and the Sīr Daryā. According to Khwārizmī, *Mafātiḥ al-'Ulūm*, p. 114, the Persians call the land beside the Oxus, Marz-i Tūrān. For Yāqūt, i. 892, Tūrān is the country of Mā warā' al-Nahr (Transoxiana); after the tripartition of the world by Afrīdūn, the Turks called their land Tūrān after their king Tūdj. (Yāqūt also mentions a village of Tūrān near Ḥarrān). Very curious is the archaïcising reference in Dimishkī, *Cosmographie* (ca. 1320), ed. St. Petersburg, p. 114, according to which the Sayhūn (Sīr-Daryā) forms the frontier between Transoxiana, i. e. "the land of the Hayātila called Tūlān (= Tūrān)" and the land of Turkestān which is called Farghāna (on Haiṭal = Transoxiana, cf. also *Ērānshahr*, p. 307). Much more vague is the use of the term in the *Masālik al-Aḥṣār* (xivth century) where the Volga is called Nahr-Tūrān and the summer camps of the old kings of Tūrān (the former Khāns of Kipčāk: Marquart, *Komanen*, p. 138) are located at Arḳ-tagh (?), identified by Quatremère and Marquart with the Ural Mountains.

In the *Zafar-nāma* (xvth century), Tūrān is only used for poetical comparisons (i. 34, 624: "the heroes of Tūrān in Iran"). Abu 'l-Ghāzī (xviiith century) sometimes uses it as 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 Muḥammad Khwārizmshāh as situated between Iran and Tūrān (*Īrān birlān Tūrān arast*; p. 96).

The term Tūrān became known in Europe from Herbelot's *Bibliothèque Orientale*, Paris 1697,

p. 63, where we are told that Afrāsiyāb, a Turk by birth but a descendant of Tūr, son of Farīdūn, was king "of all the country which lies beyond the river Oxus... to the east and north; this country used to be called Tūrān but it has since received the name of Turkeṣtān". This last term is already found in the maps of Ortelius and Mercator in the xvth century (Oberhummer). The term Tūrān became naturalised in Europe only in the sixteenth century. Its vague character has earned it a certain degree of popularity as applied to ideas where accuracy of definition is out of the question.

Bibliography: Justi, *Iran. Namenbuch*, sub Tūra, Sairima; Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wörterbuch*, sub Tūra, tūrya, Sairima; Spiegel, *Eranische Alterthumskunde*, 1875, i. 270, 546, 575, 579; Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum*, 1882, p. 193—202; Brunhofer, *Urgeschichte der Arier in Vorder- und Central-Asien*, Band I: *Iran und Turan*, Leipzig 1893, in the series *Einzelbeiträge z. allg. u. vergl. Sprachwiss.* (cf. Bartholomae *Wochenschr. f. klass. Phil.*, 1890, col. 1161); Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, p. 155—157; cf. also Marquart, *Unters. z. Gesch. v. Eran*, ii. 78, 136; Marquart, *Über d. Volkstum d. Komänen*, Berlin 1914, p. 104, 196; Feist, *Kultur, Ausbreitung u. Herkunft d. Indogermanen*, Berlin 1913, p. 404; Blochet, *Le nom des Turks dans l'Avesta*, *JRAS*, 1915, p. 305—308; Blochet, *Le pays des Tchata et les Ephtalites*, *RRAL*, 1925, N^o. 6, p. 331—351; Blochet, *Les sources grecques et chrétiennes de l'astronomie hindoue*, *Rev. de l'Orient chrétien*, xxv., 1925, p. 430—431; Blochet, *Le nom des Turks*, *ibid.*, xxvi., 1927—1928, N^o. 1, p. 188—206; Oberhummer, *Die Türken u. d. osmanische Reich*, Leipzig-Vienna 1917; Oberhummer, *Der Name Turan, Túrán*, Budapest April 1918, p. 193—208; Christensen, *Etudes sur le zoroastrisme de la Perse Antique*, *D. Kgl. Danske Vid. Selskab.*, Copenhagen 1928, p. 16; Gray, *Foundations of the Iranian religion*, Bombay 1929, in *Journ. Cama Orient. Inst.*, N^o. 15, p. 12.

Turanian languages. The inventor of this term seems to have been the historian Bunsen (1854) who applied it to those languages of Asia and Europe, which are neither Indo-European nor Semitic. The real populariser of the term was Max Müller, *The Languages of the Seat of War in the East, with a Survey of Three Families of Languages, Semitic, Arian and Turanian*, London 1855, who includes in this group (for he avoids the term "family") of agglutinative languages not only Finno-Ugrian and Altaic but also Siamese, Tibetan, Malay etc. Lenormant, *La Magie chez les Chaldéens et les origines accadiennes*, Paris 1874, extended the term to include Sumerian. J. Oppert, in *Les Peuples et la Langue des Mèdes*, Paris 1889, wrongly taking the language of the second column of the Achaemenian inscriptions (the Neo-Elamite) for Median concluded that the Medes were "Turanian". Turanian became a regular dumping ground for languages awaiting classification. But already Castrén (1862) pointed out the proper line of criticism. He first of all isolated the quintuple group of "Ural-Altaic" languages with its branches, Finno-Ugrian, Samoyed, Turko-Tatar, Mongol and Tunguz. Later researches have brought further restrictions by separating the first two of these from the last three, which form the Altaic group. G. Ramstedt, the founder of the comparative gram-

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. Deny, *Langues turques, mongoles et tounyouzes*, in *Les langues du Monde*, Paris 1924; Poppe, *La parenté des langues altaïques, Histoire et état actuel de la question* (in Russian), Bākū 1926; Sauvageot, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des langues ouralo-altaïques*, Paris 1929.

Pan-Turanianism. This political term is used on the one hand as synonymous with the Pan-Turkish movement (*Türk-djülük* "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 Tūrān, in the ideal sense of the distant fatherland, dates from 1839 (according to Count Teleki: "eine gewisse Schwärmerei für Stamm-land und Stammverwandte"). The review *Turan* founded at Budapest during the World War by the *Turanische Gesellschaft*, to judge from the Bulgar and Turkish prospectuses, was intended to study the history and civilisation "of the peoples who are related to us" (in Turkish: *bizim-le karabeti olan milletler*). The editor however (1918, N^o. 1, p. 5) took up quite a distinct attitude in the following pronouncement: "our Tūrān is geographical; it is neither the Tūrān of Max Müller, the subject of lively controversy, nor the Tūrān of political aspirations". Count Teleki and Prof. Cholnoky (*Turan, ein Landschaftsbegriff*, *ibid.*, N^o. 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-Daryā and the Irtysh and the plateau of Akmolinsk. Setting aside the value of the ideas of these authors on 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 Tūrān is quite new and personal. Broadly speaking, this Tūrān is a useless term substituted for Turkeṣtān, which has at least the merit of being a definite conception.

In Russia also we can find tendencies parallel to those of the Hungarian "Turaniens". The group called "Eurasian" has interested itself in geo-politics and the cultural influences of the Eurasian peoples; cf. I. R., *L'héritage de Čingiz-khan* (in Russian), Berlin 1925; Prince N. Troubetskoï, *Sur l'élément touranien 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 to Turkism. The highest offices were filled by non-Turks, whose conversion to Islām was often of recent date. The levies of Christian children [cf. DEWSHIRME] provided the state with the most capable civil and military officers (cf. Lybyer, *The Govern-*

ment... of *Suleiman the Magnificent*, Cambridge Mass. 1913, p. 51—56). The theory of the *sultān-khalifa* excluded the possibility of preferring the Turkish elements to the other Muslim subjects of the empire. Even in the xixth century the word *türk* had in the Ottoman empire the definite meaning of "peasant, rustic, yokel" (cf. the popular proverbs). In this connection the poem by Mehmed 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 dînsim ulu-dur*: "I am a Turk, my religion and my race are exalted ones".

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

a. The formation in the xixth century of numerous national movements (Greek, German, Italian, Slav, Armenian, Arab) 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, Mawṣil). 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 'Aṣṣm). Among the earlier works which have exerted an influence on these lines Ziyā Gök Alp mentions de 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 *intelligentsia*, primarily Turco-Tatar, and the impetus given to the Turkish press in Russia by the events of 1905. The emigrés from Russia, like 'Alī Ḥusain-zāde (Bākū), Yūsuf Aḳ-čura (Kazān) and Aḥmad Aghā-oghlu (Kārabāgh) 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 xxth century, three political theses were to the front in Turkey: Pan-Islāmism, Ottomanism and Pan-Turkism. An open discussion of these was instituted (in 1902—1903) in the journal *Türk* published in Cairo. The Pan-Turkish point of view was championed by Yūsuf Aḳ-čura-oghlu whose article *Üç tarz siyaset* (reprinted at Stambul in 1327) has played an important part in the elaboration of the programme of the movement. Aḳ-čura criticised Ottomanism as tending to diminish the privileges of the Turks and contrary to Islām which recognises equal rights for all believers. On the other hand, Pan-Islāmism 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*, Aḳ-čura's thesis was criticised by the liberal 'Alī Kemāl, in the name of Ottomanism, and by Aḥmad Ferīd on grounds of possibility, for pan-Islāmism 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 Derneyi*) was founded at Stambul with the object of studying the situation and the activities (*aḥwāl we-af'āl*) 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 *Yeñi-lisān*, *Gendj ḫalemler* etc. In 1911 the Turanian Society for the propagation of knowledge (*Tūrān neshr-i me'ārif djem'iyeti*) was created and in December appeared No. 1 of the periodical *Türk-yurdu* edited by Y. Aḳ-čura. On May 25, 1912, the *Türk odjaları* (Turkish Hearths) were founded, circles for the study of Turkish culture.

At the same time the great theorist of Turkism, Ziyā 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 poetical works he aroused the memories dormant in the blood of the Turks and sang the Turkish ideal as personified in the mysterious land of Tūrān: "The children of Oghuz-khān will never forget this country which is called Tūrān" (*Türklük*, 1911). This land is associated with Attila, Fārābī, Ulugh Beg, Ibn Sinā (the Turkish origins of the latter [q. v.] are not by any means proved). "The fatherland of the Turks is neither Turkey, nor Turkeṣtān, their fatherland is the great eternal land of Tūrān" (*Tūrān*, 1914).

The teaching of Ziyā Gök Alp was summed up in the formula "Turkicise yourself (from the point of view of culture, *ḥarīḥ*), Islāmice yourself, modernise yourself (from the point of view of civilisation, *medeniyet*)". The systematic exposition of the theories of this writer will be found in *Türkçülüğün esāsları*, "The foundations of Turkism", published at Angora in 1339 (1923) a year before the author's death. In this work, the idea of Tūrān is a little more practical. Ziyā Gök Alp defines the nation as a group of individuals connected by language, religion, ethics and aesthetics. Tūrān is not a mixture of Turks, Mongols, Tunguz, Finns and Hungarians. "The word Tūrān 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 Oghuz-Turks, i. e. the Turks of Turkey and the Turkomans of Ādharbāidjān, of Persia and Khwārizm. 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 "Tūrān" will serve as a common term

for all the peoples enumerated, forming an ethnical union (*djāmi'e*).

Tūrānian romanticism has had various repercussions in the purely literary field in the works of Ahmad Hikmat (*Alln ordu*), Khālide Edīb Khānīm (*Yeñi Tūrān*, 1913), Aka Gündüz (*Muhterem kätıl*, a drama produced in 1914 whose subject is a Turkish rising in the Caucasus), Müfide Ferid Khānīm (*Ay Demir*, a Turkish rising in Central Asia). On literary Tūrānianism during the War, cf. M. Hartmann, *M.S.O.S.*, 1918, xxi., p. 19—22.

During the War of 1914, the Young Turks (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-Litowsk, Turkey obtained the return to the frontier of 1877 in Transcaucasia (surrender by Russia of Batum, Kars and Ardahān). The refusal of the Turks of Ādharbāidjān to resist the Ottomans put an end to the Transcaucasian confederation (April 22, 1918), which was replaced by three independent republics (Ādharbāidjān, Georgia and Armenia). Under the command of Enwer Pāshā's brother, the Turks advanced as far as Petrowsk on the Caspian Sea but the armistice of Mudros (Oct. 30, 1918) forced them to turn back. The English then occupied and later withdrew from Transcaucasia. While in the capital, occupied by the Allies, Dāmād Ferid Pāshā's government *in extremis* was making a last attempt to unfold a programme of Ottomanism, the nationalist government was formed in Asia Minor (summer of 1919) and by energetic measures was able to retain the ground gained by the Young Turks at Brest-Litowsk. The republic of Armenia was conquered (Peace of Alexandropol of Dec. 3, 1920). Georgia declared its neutrality and submitted to the ultimatum (of Feb. 23, 1921) which demanded the evacuation of Artwin and Ardahān. On March 16, 1921, the Turkish-Soviet treaty was signed at Moscow and on Oct. 13 confirmed at Kars, with the participation of the three Caucasian republics (now Soviets). Turkey withdrew her claim to Batum but, what was not in the Brest-Litowsk treaty, received the district of Iğdir on the Araxes (which Persia had ceded to Russia in 1828) and thus enabled her territory to be contiguous to that of Nakhičewān, which had been created as a dependency of the Soviet republic of Ādharbāidjān.

The government of Angora thus secured concrete gains in Transcaucasia but publicly disowned Enwer Pāshā's achievements, who had at first allied himself with the Soviet government but finally raised the standard of revolt in Turkestan where he dreamed of founding a Turkish empire. He fell in a skirmish in eastern Bukhārā on Aug. 4, 1922 ("as a martyr to Turkism" as his colleague Dr. Nāzim said at the trial of the Young Turks in August 1926); cf. Castagné, *Les basmatchis*, Paris 1927.

Cultural Movement. The old leaders of the Tūrānian movement had early rallied to the government of Angora. (The poet Mehmed Emīn

and Aḳ-čura Oghlu arrived at Angora in April 1921). From April 23, 1924 the Turkish Hearths (*Türk odjahlari*) resumed their activity in Angora under the leadership of Hamdullāh-Subhī. Their first *kurultai* met at Angora on March 28, 1926. In 1928 Yūsuf Aḳ-čura produced at Stambul the annual *Türk yılı* (The Turkish Year) with summaries of the doings of Turks abroad. As a result of the Russian revolution of 1917 a new wave of emigration swept over Turkey. The supporters of the old nationalist governments overthrown by the Soviets established the review *Yeñi Kafkasiya* (1924) which was succeeded in March 1929 by the *Odlu Yurt* "Land of Fire" (= Ādharbāidjān). These organs of Turkish solidarity have not however linked up with the local Turkish press.

As regards the Turks in what was the Russian empire, since the revolution of 1917, they have realised and even gone beyond their old programme of establishing their own civilisation and autonomy. But alongside of this natural evolution, the Turks of the U. R. S. S. have actively and passively 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 Bākū from Feb. 26 to March 6, 1926 (131 delegates, Soviet and foreign, including two from Turkey) were of great interest (see the shorthand reports published in Russian, Bākū 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, *Il nuovo alfabeto, Oriente 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 Islāmic prestige of the old Stambul. The intensity of its influence will therefore depend primarily on the worth of the Turkish culture (*harth*) which will be developed there. Even the bringing of all Turks "descended from Oghuz" under one culture according to Ziyā 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 Persian culture, 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: Aḳ-čura-oghlu, *Üç tars siyaset*, in the journal *Türk*, Cairo (reprinted Stambul 1327); Ömer Seyfeddin, *Yarınki Turan devleti*, Stambul 1330; Martin Hartmann, *Chinesisch-Turkestan*, Halle 1908, *passim*; do.

Unpolitische Briefe aus d. Türkei, Leipzig 1910, *passim*; do., *Aus d. neueren osman. Dichtung M.S.O.S.*, xix. (1916), p. 124—179; xx. (1917), p. 86—149; xxi. (1918), p. 1—82; x. (= Takīzāde), *Les courants politiques en Turquie*, R.M.M., xxi., 1912, p. 158—222; do., *Le panislamisme et le pantouranisme*, R.M.M., xxii., 1913, p. 179—221; Tekin Alp (= Moses Kohen), *Turkismus und Panturkismus*, Weimar 1915; Lothrop Stoddard, *Panturanism*, *The Amer. Polit. Science Review*, 1917, xi. 12—23; *A manual on the Turanians and Pan-turanianism compiled by the Geogr. Section of the Naval Intelligence Division*, Naval Staff Admiralty, London 1917 (mainly an enumeration of "Turānian" peoples and tribes including the Samoyeds and Finno-Ugrians); *Muhammedan History*, N^o. 57 of the *Handbooks prepared under the direction of the historical section of the Foreign Office*, London 1920 (contains the chapter *The rise of the Turks and the pan-Turanian movement*) [the materials for these two volumes were collected on the occasion of the Peace Conference]; Ahmed Muhied-din, *Die Kulturbewegung im modernen Türkentum*, Leipzig 1921; Ahmed Emin, *The development of Modern Turkey as measured by its press*, New York 1924; Ziyā Gök Alp, *Türkçülüğün esāsları*, Angora 1339 (1923) [excellent résumé by R. Hartmann, *Grundlagen des türk. Nationalismus*, O.L.Z., 1925, N^o. 9—10, col. 578—610 and by E. Rossi, *Oriente Moderno*, 1925, p. 574—595]; Zarevand, *Turtsiya i panturanism*, Paris 1930 (in Russian, from the Armenian point of view; European bibliography).

(V. MINORSKY)

TURĀNSHĀH B. AIYŪB AL-MALIK AL-MU'AZ-ZAM SHAMS AL-DAWLA FAKHR AL-DĪN, founder of the Aiyūbid dynasty of the Yemen.

He was born at the beginning of Rādjab 569 (February 1174); two years before, the death of the last Fāṭimid 'Adid [q. v.] had formally made Saladin lord of Egypt; the relationship of vassal and overlord between him and the Zangid Atābeg Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd had now become unnatural and threatened to end in war; King Amalrich of Jerusalem, with whom Saladin had been fighting, was still unsubdued; the Crusaders of Kerak and Shawbak [q. v.] were harassing the roads to Egypt. That Saladin should choose such a time for the conquest of Yemen is remarkable and is not completely explained by the religious grounds which induced him to wage this war, namely the expulsion of the Khāridjī Maḥdī [q. v.] from Zabīd and of the Shī'ī Banū Karam [q. v.] who were formally incorporated in the Fāṭimid hierarchy from 'Aden. It is characteristic of Saladin's foresight that he wished to secure for himself a province to which he could retire on any emergency; the general situation indicated that this could only be found in the south, where alone his troops could be employed; for if he wanted to avoid an open breach with Nūr al-Dīn, it was best to leave Frankish power in Palestine as a bulwark between them for the time. Only a year before, he had sent to Nubia one of his five brothers, an elder one, Tūrānshāh, whose name popular rumour had connected with the death of the last Fāṭimid; but Tūrānshāh did not think the country worth the difficulty and expense of taking it. The old-established relations between the holy cities and Egypt now attracted his attention to the Arabian

peninsula at the northern approach to which the port of Aila [q. v.] had already been occupied in 566 (1171). Tūrānshāh was therefore sent to Yemen, took Zabīd in Shawwāl of the year 569 (May 1174), 'Aden in the same year and in the following year drove from Ṣan'ā' the Ḥamdānid 'Alī b. Ḥātim al-Wahīd, whose power to resist had been weakened by the continual attacks of the Zaidī Imām Aḥmad b. Sulaimān of Ṣa'da. Tūrānshāh however did not feel comfortable in a country where snow never fell and he could not obtain his favourite fruits. As a result of urgent representations to his brother, he obtained a transfer to Syria in 571, which had in the meanwhile passed to Saladin on the death of Nūr al-Dīn. After spending three years in Damascus as governor of Syria, his brother transferred him to Alexandria where he died on 1st Ṣafar 576 (June 27, 1180).

The career of Tūrānshāh is not unimportant but the initiative was always Saladin's; Tūrānshāh was more a man who enjoyed life. Even while still in Egypt he had acquired considerable wealth; from the Nubian campaign he brought back many slaves, including the Christian metropolitan; before the Yemen campaign he had been given large old family fiefs in 'Baalbek; in Yemen itself his brother gave him rich estates as his personal property. On leaving there, his main anxiety was that his representative should send him the revenues promptly. This man with all these estates nevertheless left behind him 200,000 dīnārs of debts which his brother paid. The body of Tūrānshāh, always homesick for Syria, was taken by his sister Sitt al-Shām Zumurrud and buried beside the medresa built by her in Damascus.

The Aiyūbid conquest was of considerable significance for the Yemen. The three small states there were combined and united to a great power. The occupation was very thoroughly carried through. It is true that the last Ḥamdānid was able to escape to the highlands, but the last Maḥdī 'Abd al-Nabī and his two brothers and the last real ruler of the Karam, the major domo Yāsir, were put to death some time after their surrender by Tūrānshāh's orders. The latter's departure so soon after the conquest was not calculated to keep the conquered territory together. Dangerous risings at once broke out. It was only when Saladin sent his other brother Tuḡhtegīn Saif al-Islām who stayed there from 578—593 (1182—1196) that Aiyūbid rule became more of a reality. He was followed by his sons Mu'izz al-Dīn Ismā'il till 598 (1201) and al-Nāṣir Aiyūb till 611 (1214); both were assassinated. In 612 (1215) the head of the family, Saladin's brother al-'Adīl Saif al-Islām Abū Bakr, sent his young grandson al-Mas'ūd Yūsuf there. The gradual breakdown in family discipline however had resulted shortly before this in a great-grandson of Saladin's brother, Nūr al-Dīn Shāhānshāh called al-Muẓaffar Sulaimān, on the appeal of Nāṣir's brother, establishing himself in Yemen, posing as a Ṣūfī with a retinue of Ṣūfis. Along with Tūrānshāh, five brothers of the family of the Banū Rasūl had come into the country and soon attained great importance as indispensable councillors and wealthy owners of land. In the fight between Sulaimān and Yūsuf, 'Alī b. Rasūl brought about the success of the latter, conquered the Ḥijāz in his name and was appointed wālī of Mecca in 619 (1222). His son 'Omar, after the death of the weak Yūsuf in 626 (1228), assuming

d. 1035 (1626); 11. A. b. M. b. A. al-Makkari, *Azhār al-Kumāma fī Akhbār al-Imāma*, d. 1041 (1632), cf. *G.A.L.*, ii. 296; 12. Abu 'l-Faḍl M. b. A. "Ibn al-Imām", *Tuḥfat al-Umma bi-Aḥkām al-Imma*, d. 1062 (1652), Ḥādjdjī Khalifa, No. 2551; 13. Shihāb al-Dīn A. b. M. al-Khaḥfādjī al-Efendi (Shāriḥ al-Shifā), *al-Thimāma fī Ṣifat al-Imāma*, d. 1069 (1659), cf. *G.A.L.*, ii. 285; 14. al-Saiyid M. b. Mawlāya Dja'far al-Kattānī, *al-Di'āma li-Ma'rifat Aḥkām Sunnat al-Imāma*, modern, printed Damascus 1342 [s. the art. KATTĀNĪ].

No. 14 is the most detailed monograph on the turban and has been much used for the above article. Of other writings he mentions No. 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, but has himself only seen and used No. 8. In addition to No. 14 we have used No. 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 Kostüms*, 5 vols, plates with brief descriptions, pl. 297 on the turban; J. v. Falke, *Kostümgeschichte der Kulturvölker*; Alb. Kretschmer, *Die Trachten der Völker*; *Katalog der Lipperheideschen Kostümbibliothek*. — 16 forms of turban are illustrated by Fesquet, 44 different ones by Niebuhr, and no less than 286 are given by Michael Thalman, *Elenchus librorum or. mss.*, Vienna 1702, vi. 29 sq. on Cod. turc., vii., Bologna (according to *E. I.*, ii. 751); cf. Victor Rosen, *Remarques sur les mss. orientaux de la Collection Marsigli à Bologne (Atti della Real Acc. dei Lincei, 281, 1883—1884)*, p. 182. (W. BJÖRKMAN)

TURBAT-I HAIDARĪ. [See ZĀWA.]

TURBAT-I SHAIKH-I DJĀM, a place in the north-east of Persia (province of Khurāsān), not far from the Afghān frontier; its position is approximately 61° East Long. and 35° N. Lat. It is a stage on the Mashhad-Herāt road (the distance from Turbat-i Shaikh-i Djām to Mashhad is about 96 miles, roughly half the distance between Mashhad and Herāt) and lies on a tributary of the Harīrūd. 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 under the direct authority of the district governor. Turbat-i Shaikh-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 Shaikh Ahmad-i Djāmī (d. 536 = 1142; cf. the article AHMAD DJĀMĪ). According to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (ed. Paris, iii. 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 Baṭṭūṭa further tells about the Shaikh is obviously local tradition without any great historical value. The tomb was visited by Tīmūr and at a later date by Humāyūn.

The mediaeval name of Turbat-i Shaikh-i Djām was Būzdjān (also Pūčkān; Yākūt, iii. 890 sq., gives a further variant: Fuzz or Fazz, while some scholars have the nisba al-Fazzī; the nisba,

al-Būzdjānī, of course, is also found). It was the capital of the district of Djām (also written Zām) in the N. E. of Kūhistān. According to Yākūt, Būzdjān lies 4 days' journey from Nisābūr and 6 from Herāt, while al-Iṣṭakhri (p. 282) gives four days' journey as the distance from Būzdjān to Būshandj. 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), Djām belonged to the 19 *rasāṭik* dependent on Nisābūr. Al-Muḥaddasī (at least according to the text quoted in de Goeje, p. 319, note *c*) says that the name Būzdjān is only applied to the town (*kaṣr*) 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-kaṣr* with *al-madīna*.

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

TURFAN, usually written Turfān, locally pronounced *Turfan*, a town in Chinese Turkistān. The oasis, fertile although suffering from a scarcity of water, between the depression of Lukcun, which lies below the sea-level, and the ranges of the Thian-shan, 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 Kū-shi was here; in the year 60 B. C. it was destroyed by the Chinese and eight small principalities took its place, including anterior Kū-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 Klementz (*Nachrichten über die von der Kais. Akad. der Wiss. zu St. Petersburg im Jahre 1898 ausgerüstete Expedition nach Turfan*, St. Petersburg 1899, p. 24 sqq.). Considerable importance was later attained by the Chinese settlement Kao-čang, called in Turki first Khočo (Maḥmūd Kāshgharī, i. 103: Kūdju), later Karā-Khodja, now the ruins of Idikut-shahrī, 20—25 miles east of Turfan. Immediately south of the modern Turfan lie the ruins called Old Turfan by Klementz (*op. cit.*, p. 28); according to S. Franke (*Eine chinesische Tempelinschrift aus Idikutshahrī 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 Idikut-shahrī.

Turfan is not mentioned in the Mongol period and not on the Chinese map of 1331 (E. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources*, vol. ii.). The only suggestion that there was perhaps a town of Turfan in ancient times also, is found in a Śaka document found in Tun-Huang 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 Tturpamni 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-

bassies on the way to China were robbed at Turfan and a 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 *Ta'rikh-i Rashidī*, Khfzr Khodja, Khān of Moghulistān (c. 1389–1399), undertook a campaign against "Karā Khodja and Turfan, two very important towns on the frontiers of China"; the inhabitants were forced to adopt Islām and the two towns were henceforth regarded as within the territory of Islām (*Dār al-Islām*) (*Ta'rikh-i Rashidī*, transl. Ross, p. 52). When the celebrated embassy of the Timūrid Shāhrukh [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 Śakyamuni (Shākemūnī) and many other idols, some old, some of recent erection (*N. E.*, xiv., p. 310 and the original text of Hāfiz-i Abrū [q. v.] in Barthold, *al-Muzaf-fariya*, p. 27). The present inhabitants of Turfan (Turfānīk) 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 Dākṡyānūs [see AṢHĀB AL-KAHF].

Turfan suffered in those days from want of water even more than it does now. In the reign of Wais-Khān (1418–1428) agriculture was conducted in a very primitive and laborious fashion; the Khān had a deep well dug and out of this he himself and his slaves drew water for their fields in earthen vessels (*kūza*) (*Ta'rikh-i Rashidī*, p. 67). Conditions seem to have improved later; towards the end of the xviith century the land of Čalsh (the modern Karāshahr) obtained its corn from Turfan (*Zap.*, xv., 251; quoted by M. Hartmann, *Der islamische 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 Čaghatāi Khān in the modern Chinese Turkistān (xvth—xviiith century) Turfan is frequently mentioned as the residence of various Khāns; 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 Aq-su, 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 (Köhne Turfan). In the time of Ya'qūb 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" (*wang*) of Lukčun. 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 Ya'qūb Beg; east of it is the Chinese fort, which, according to Grum-Gržimailo (*Opisanie puteshestviya v Zapadny 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, *Rese i Zentralasien 1898*, Helsingfors 1901, p. 120; A. v. le Coq, *Auf Hellas Spuren in Ostturkistan*, Leipzig 1926, pl. 2). The minaret was not, as has been asserted, a Christian belfry, but was only built in 1760 by a *wang* of Lukčun. 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., 1880, p. 205 sqq.; Sir A. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, Oxford 1928, p. 566 sqq. where further references are given; G. Grum-Gržimailo, *Opisanie puteshestviya v Zapadny Kitai*, i., St. Petersburg 1896, chap. xii–xvi.; A. Grünwedel, *Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten in Idikutschari und Umgebung im Winter 1902–1903*, Munich 1905 (*Abh. Bayer. Akad.*, Kl. i., vol. xxiv., ser. i.), p. 4; S. Oldenburg, *Russkaya Turkestankaya Ekspediciya 1909–1910*, St. Petersburg 1914, p. 25.

(W. BARTHOLD)

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 Karān-saldī Turgai, which receives the Tasī Turgai, and the Kara Turgai, and flows into Lake Durukča; north of it runs the Sarī Turgai, which is called Ulkun-tamdī in its upper course and receives from the west the Muıldī-Turgai and the Sarī-bui Turgai. The Sarī Turgai flows into Lake Sarī-Kopa. In Turkish *turghai* or *torghai* means "little bird" (Radloff, *Wörterbuch*, iii. 1184, 1457); Karā Turghai is a name of the starling. The fortifications of Orenburg are called *Torghai Kala*.

The modern town of 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 (Orenburgskoje Ukreplenje). In 1865 the territory of the Orenburg Kirgiz was divided into two provinces (*oblast'*), the Ural and the Turgai. When the Turgai province in 1868 was divided into districts (*uezd*), 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, *Turgaiskiya Oblastnaya Vedomosti*. 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 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 Irgiz and Perowsk (now called Kızıl-Orda).

Before Russian rule the present Turgai territory was inhabited only by nomads and hardly mentioned in political history. An exception is Nasawī's account (ed. Houdas, p. 9 *sqq.*) of the campaign of the Khwārizm-shāh [q. v.] Muḥammad in the year 612 (1215—1216) against the Kıpçak and his encounter with the Mongols; cf. Barthold, *Turkestan* etc. = *G. M. S.*, N. S. v., p. 370 *sqq.*; J. Marquart, *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*, Berlin 1914, p. 128 *sqq.* where on p. 133 a later date (midsummer 1219) is assumed.

Turgai now belongs to the autonomous republic of Kaḫāzistān. 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 Aktynbinsk, the most southerly part of the former Turgai province to the area of Kızıl-Orda.

Bibliography: *Rossiya*, xviii.; *Kirgizskii Krai*, Petersburg 1903, esp. p. 341 *sq.* and map; articles by Ya. Polferov and A. Kaufman, in *Enciklop. Slovar'*, Brokhaus-Efron, xxxiv. (1902); *Aziatskaya Rossiya*, i., Petersburg 1914, p. 347 and 351. — On modern conditions I have been informed by word of mouth.

(W. BARTHOLD)

TURKISTĀN 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 Irān, 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. *ĀMŪ-DARYĀ*). In the time of the Sāsānians therefore the land of the Turks began immediately north of the Oxus; according to the story given in Ṭabarī (i. 435 *sq.*) the Oxus was settled by an arrow-shot of Irāsh as the frontier between the Turks and the "territory (*amal*) of the Persians". According to the Armenian Sebēos (seventh century A. D.) the Vehrot, i. e. the Oxus, rises in the land of Tūrka'stan (*Histoire d'Héraclius par l'évêque Sebēos*, transl. by Fr. Macler, Paris, 1904, p. 49; J. Marquart, *Ērānshahr*, p. 48); in another passage in the same work (p. 43; Marquart, p. 73) Tūrka'stan is associated with Delhastan i. e. Dehistān (in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea, north of the Atrak [q. v.]).

By the victories of the Arabs, the Turks were driven far back to the north; for the Arab geographers of the third (ninth) and fourth (tenth) centuries, Turkestan therefore began, not immediately north of the Oxus, but only north of the area of Arab culture known as "the lands beyond the river" Mā warā' al-Nahr [q. v.]. Turkistān, the land of the Turks, was then regarded as the regions north and east of Mā warā' al-Nahr. The town of Kāsān in Farghāna [q. v.] north of the Sīr-Daryā [q. v.] was "where the land of Turkistān begins" (*Yākūt*, iv. 227). The towns of Djand and Shahrkand on the lower course of the same river were in Turkistān (*op. cit.*, ii. 127; iii. 344); in Turkistān lay the town of Khotan (*op. cit.*, ii. 403). From this use of the name it has been held (especially

by M. Hartmann, *Chinesisch-Turkestan*, Halle 1908, p. 1) that the name "Turkestan" was first applied by the Russian conquerors of Central Asia quite arbitrarily to the land of Mā warā' al-Nahr. As a matter of fact, the name Turkistān 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 Afghānistān the "Turks in Turkistān" were their immediate neighbours on the north; thus in a lullaby taken down in Shīrāz in 1886 we are told "Two Turks came from Turkistān, brought me to Hindūstān" (V. Žukovskiy, *Obrazci persidskago narodnago tvorčestva*, St. Petersburg, 1902, p. 169 *sq.*). Through the Özbek conquests of the xvth century a new Turkistān arose south of the Āmū-Daryā. The corresponding province of Afghānistān still bears the name of Turkistān; as the southern frontiers of this Turkestan some travellers (R. Burslem, *A Peep in Toorkistan*, London, 1846, p. 57 *sq.*) give the pass of Ak Rabat north of Bāmiyān [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 Āmū Daryā is; farther west, in the region between the Murghāb and the Āb-i Maimana, the frontier of Turkistān is given as the range of Band (or Tīrband)-i Turkistān. The name Turkistān was introduced into the scientific terminology of the sixteenth century, not by the Russians but by the English, probably under the influence of the Persian and Afghān usage.

In literature, especially in travellers' records, a distinction has usually been made between Russian, Chinese and Afghān Turkestan, although the word Turkestan (or Turkistān) had an administrative significance only in Russia and Afghānistān. 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 Tashkent [q. v.] as its capital. The frontiers of this governor-generalship were sometimes contracted, sometimes extended. From 1882 to 1898 the province of Semiryečye, at one time included in Turkestan, belonged to the governor-generalship of the Steppes with Omsk as its capital. In 1898 Semiryečye and the Transcaspian province (Turcomania) were incorporated in Turkestan.

In 1886 Prof. I. Mushketow 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 nebst einer allgemeinen Schilderung des Turkestanischen Beckens*, Leipzig 1877, he proposed to give the name Turkestan or the Turkestan basin to the lands between the central mountains of Central Asia and the basin of the Caspian Sea, the Iranian plateau and the sea of ice; Mushketow had no doubt that the frontier between Russia and England in the not distant future would be established on the Hindū-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"). Mushketow 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 Tadjikistan. 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 under the Özbegs for a town on the middle course of the Sīr Daryā. From the accounts of the Arab geographers it may be assumed that in the fourth (tenth) century the town of Shāwghar (in Le Strange, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge 1905, p. 485: Shāvaghār) must have stood there: unfortunately no trace of it has been found. In the xvth century and probably as early as the xiith, the later Turkestan was called Yasī and is mentioned as late as the history of Tīmūr (*Zafar-Nāma*, Ind. ed., ii. 9) as a village (*ḵarya*). The importance of the town increased from the cult — first known in the Mongol period — of the saint Ahmad Yesewī [q. v.], regarded as the converter of the Turks to Islām (on his period see also Barthold, in *Der Islām*, xiv. 112), and especially after the splendid tomb had been erected there by Tīmūr. The saint was regarded as the patron of the land of the Turks and was called Ḥadrat-i Turkistān, 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.

Bibliography: In addition to the reference in the text: Mushketow, *Turkestan*, St. Petersburg 1886, 2nd ed. 1915; W. Barthold, *Stand und Aufgaben der Geschichtsforschung in Turkestan* (*Die Geisteswissenschaften*, i. 1913–1914, p. 1075 sqq.); do., *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, 1928 (*G.M.S.*, new ser. v.); do., *Istoriya kulturnoi žizni Turkestana* Leningrad 1927; W. Masalskij, *Turkestanskij kraj*, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 600 sqq.; A. Dobrosłowski, *Goroda Sīr-Dar'inskoi oblasti*, Tashkent 1912. — On the tomb see especially M. Masson, in *Izv. Sredne Az. Geograf Obšč.*, xix. (1929) p. 39 sqq.

(W. BARTHOLD)

TÜRKMĀN-ĀI (better T-āyī), a village in the district of Gārmārūd in the province of Ādharbāidjān. Türkman-āi, "the river of the Turkomans", is really the name of the stream on which the village stands; it comes down from the Čičākli pass (between Türkman-āi and Sarāb). It is one of the northern tributaries of the river of Miyāna (*Shāhār-āyī*) which flows into the Kīzīl-üzān (cf. the article SAFID-RŪD). The village of Türkman-āi marks a stage on the great Tabriz-Zandjān-Ḳazwīn-Tīhrān-Ḳhūrāsān road. The distances are Tabriz-Türkman-āi c. 60 miles; Türkman-āi-Zandjān c. 80 miles. Ḥamdullāh in the *Nuzhat al-Ḳulūb*, *G. M. S.*, xxiii. 183, puts these distances at 16 and 25 farsakhs respectively. He calls the village Türkman-kāndi; the word *kand* = village, only used in Ādharbāidjān and unknown elsewhere in Persia, is certainly of eastern Iranian origin (cf. Sogdian, *kantā*, town; cf. Barthold,

Istoriya Kultur. Žizni Turkestana, Leningrad 1927, p. 38); the word must have been brought into Ādharbāidjān by Turkish invaders. Ḥamdullāh also says that at one time the village was a town, the Iranian name of which, Dih Ḳharrān (several variants), he gives.

Clavijo, ed. Sreznewski (St. Petersburg 1881, p. 172 and 354), calls Türkman-āi *Tucelar* and *Tunglar* (evidently a corruption of Türk-lār) and says that it is inhabited by Turkomans.

Türkman-āi 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 1813, Russia annexed the *khanates* of Eriwān and Nakhicewān and received from Persia a contribution of 5,000,000 *tūmāns* = 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 Persian-Soviet treaty of Feb. 28, 1921. Since 1918 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-āi is mentioned by all the travellers who have gone from Tabriz-Ḳazwīn, cf. Hommaire de Hell, *Voyage*, Paris 1854–1860, iii. 83–84 (the village has 200 houses) and the atlas pl. lvi. (room where the treaty was signed); Brugsch, *Reise*, Leipzig 1862–1864, i. 181; Lycklama a Nijeholt, *Voyage*, ii. 85; H. Schindler, *Reisen*, *Zeitschr. Gesell. Erdk.*, 1883, p. 333 (100 houses, altitude 5,285 feet).

The text of the treaty of 1828 in F. Martens, *Nouveau recueil des traités*, vii/2, 1830, p. 564–572; Šanīf al-Dawla, *Mir'āt al-buldān* i. 410–418; Yuzefovič, *Dogovorī Rossii s vostokom*, St. Petersburg 1869, p. 214–227; Hertslet, *Treaties concluded between Great Britain and Persia*, etc., London 1891. Analysis of the treaty in Greenfield, *Die Verfassung des pers. Staates*, Berlin 1904; K. Vollers, *Das Orientalische Münzkabinett der Universität Jena im Jahre 1906*, Dresden 1906, p. 7. (V. MINORSKY)

TURKOMANS, a Turkish people in Central Asia. The name has been used since the fifth (xith) century, first in the Persian plural form *Turkmānān*, by the Persian historians Gardīzi [q. v.] (cf. also now the printed edition by Muḥ. Nazim, *E. G. Browne Mem.*, vol. 1, Berlin 1928) and Abu 'l-Faḍl Baiḥāḳī [q. v.] in the same sense as the Turkish *Oghuz*, Arab. *Ghuzz* [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 Ṭabarī's commentary on the Qurʾān (and frequently later). Israel is oppressed by ‘Amālek (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 Dunyā, the world) who seems to be lamenting him that fed and clothed her. ‘Uzair asks her who cared for her before her husband. She replies “Allāh!”. But, says ‘Uzair, Allāh still lives. The woman then asks who had taught mankind before Israel. “Allāh”, replies ‘Uzair. But Allāh still lives, says the supernatural woman. At her bidding ‘Uzair then 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 ‘Ulamā’ dig up the Torah and find complete agreement; from this they conclude that ‘Uzair must be the son of God.

In *R. E. J.*, 1904, xlix. 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).

Sūra 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, we raise them and clothe 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.

Bibliography: Ṭabarī, ed. de Goeje, i. 669—671; the commentaries on Sūra ii. 261 and ix. 30, esp. Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, Cairo 1321, iii. 18—20; x. 68—69; al-Damīrī, *Hayāt al-Haiyawān*, s. v. *Himār al-ahlī*; al-Thaʿlabī, *Kiṣaṣ al-Anbiyāʾ*, Cairo 1325, p. 217—219; Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?*, Leipzig 1902², p. 191, 192; Heller, in *R. E. J.*, 1904, xlix. 207—213; Joseph Horowitz, in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, ii., 1925, p. 169, 182; Paul Casanova, *Idris et ‘Ouzair*, in *J. A.*, 1924, ccv. 356—360. (BERNHARD HELLER)

UZBEK (Özbek) B. MUḤAMMAD PAHLAWĀN B. ILDECİZ (Eldigüz?), fifth and last atābek of Ādharbāidjān (607—622 = 1210—1225). According to Yāqūt, Uzbek's *laqab* was Muẓaffar al-Dīn.

His mother and that of his elder brother Abū Bakr were slaves, while the two other sons of Pahlawān, Kutluḡ-Inanč and Amīrmīrān, were born of the princess Inanč-Khātun. Uzbek married Malika-Khātun, wife of the last Saldjūq Sulṭān Tuḡhrīl II, by whom he had a son (Tuḡhrīl).

Like all the reigns in periods of transition, Uzbek's was a very troubled one. Before his accession to the throne of Ādharbāidjān, the centre of his activities was at Hamadhān where he was under fire from his ruling brother Abū Bakr (587—607), the Khwārizmshāh, the caliph and the various ambitious slaves. After his accession he was the object of attacks by the Georgians and the Mongols and finally he was dispossessed by the Khwārizmshāh Djalāl al-Dīn. His neighbours in the west were the Atābek of Irbil (Arbil) and the Aiyūbids of Khilāt (Akhlāt).

Before his accession. In 592 (1196) at the time when the Khwārizmshāh Tākāsh [q. v.] had invaded Persia, the Atābek Uzbek who had fled from his brother Abū Bakr, Atābek of Ādharbāidjān, came to Tākāsh who gave him Hamadhān as a fief (*Djahān-gushā*, ii. 38). According to the *Rāḥat al-Ṣudūr*, p. 388, it was Abū Bakr who sent Uzbek to Hamadhān and had sent ‘Izz al-Dīn Satmaz with him; but soon the Pādīshāh Malik Djamāl al-Dīn Ay-ābā (a considerable amīr, lord of the fortress of Farrazīn; cf. SULṬĀNĀBĀD and the preface to the Persian translation of ‘Utbi's history: Rieu, *Catalogue*, i. 158) joined Uzbek and became his atābek, with his sons-in-law as his lieutenants. On 9th Djumādā II, 593 (April 29, 1197) an expedition sent from Baghdād seized Hamadhān. Ay-ābā fled and Uzbek was placed in direct dependence on the caliph (cf. the details in Ibn al-Aṭhīr, xii. 82). Finally the slave Miyādjik, a devoted servant of the Khwārizmshāh (and assassin of Kutluḡ Inanč), became master of the situation. But in Rādjab 593 (May—June 1197) Uzbek returned to Hamadhān and Abū Bakr, resuming supreme control, sent him new advisers. The *Rāḥat al-Ṣudūr* gives Uzbek the title of *malik*. The situation was a troubled one and in 594 Uzbek set out for Qazwīn in order to fight Miyādjik but had to retreat to Zandjān, while his adversary, encouraged by the caliph, occupied Hamadhān and on 20th Rādjab 594 (May 28, 1198) received investiture from the Khwārizmshāh also. Miyādjik was even trying to obtain the title of sulṭān when Abū Bakr's forces led by Ay-ābā defeated him near Kihā (district of Raiy). For a short time the Atābek Abū Bakr occupied Raiy but evacuated it after a false alarm. Miyādjik returned to Raiy but by his tyranny provoked the dissatisfaction of his Khwārizmī patrons who finally executed him in Khwārizm. Uzbek with his lieutenant Kökčā massacred the Khwārizmians in the Irāk. Abū Bakr was able to occupy Iṣfahān and divide the country: Malik Uzbek receiving Hamadhān and Kökčā Raiy. The supreme control of affairs was in the hands of Ay-ābā, who was much too tolerant of the misdeeds of his son-in-law Kökčā. Abū Bakr deprived of all authority (on his weakness cf. Ibn al-Aṭhīr, xii. 120) went to Uzbek but ultimately came back to Ādharbāidjān while Persian Irāk was plunged into

anarchy (cf. the evidence of contemporaries: *Rāhat al-Ṣudūr*, p. 398, and the Persian translation of 'Utbi [cf. preface, Teherān edition, 1274, p. 10]; cf. Defrémery, *op. cit.*).

In 600 (Ibn al-Athīr, xii. 128) Abū Bakr sent Ay-toghmiṣh to dispose of Kōkčā who had in the meanwhile taken Raiy, Hamadhān and Djabal (Media). Kōkčā was killed and Uzbek became *malik*, with Ay-toghmiṣh as adviser and guardian. In 602 Ay-toghmiṣh came to the help of Abū Bakr and enabled him to take Marāgha [q. v.] but in the end only allowed him to have Ādharbāidjān and Arrān (*ibid.*, p. 186, 194).

Uzbek-Atābek. Uzbek had probably retired to the north where in 607 (1210) he succeeded Abū Bakr (Ibn al-Athīr says nothing of this).

In 608 another slave Māngli took the place of Ay-toghmiṣh who was finally slain in 610 (*ibid.*, p. 194, 196, 197). Māngli took up an independent attitude to his master Uzbek. The caliph took the side of Uzbek and brought about the intervention of the Atābek of Irbil in his favour. The lands of Māngli were divided and Uzbek gave his share to his slave Aghlamish (in 612; *ibid.*, p. 201). It should however be noted that Aghlamish said the *khutba* in name of the Khwārizmshāh and the latter regarded him as his lieutenant (cf. Nasawī, p. 13).

In 614, the Ismā'īlians assassinated Aghlamish and the Atābek of Fārs Sa'd occupied Raiy and Uzkek Iṣfahān. Hearing this the Khwārizmshāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad came to Djabal (Media) and scattered the allies. Uzbek withdrew to Ādharbāidjān while his dignitaries, the prince of Ahar Nuṣrat al-Dīn Bēshgēn (of Georgian origin) and the vizier Rabīb al-Dīn, were captured. By an arrangement with Uzbek the Khwārizmshāh left him Ādharbāidjān and Arrān, but forced him to read the *khutba* and strike coins in his name (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, xii. 207; Nasawī, p. 17).

The Mongols. When in 617 (1220) the Tatars appeared before the walls of Tabrīz, 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 Khilāt, but the Tatars reinforced by troops whom a Turkish slave of Uzbek named Aḳūsh (Aghush?) had collected for them, frustrated these plans by a new attack on Tiflīs [q. v.] and came in 618 for a second time to Tabrīz. Once again Uzbek ransomed the city (*ibid.*, p. 246). When they came to Tabrīz for a third time (*ibid.*, p. 250), Uzbek left for Nakhičawān and sent his family to Khoi. "He held all Ādharbāidjān and all Arrān and in spite of this was the most helpless creature to protect his country against the enemy" says Ibn al-Athīr (*ibid.*, p. 250).

In 619 the Kīpčak, who had penetrated into Transcaucasia via Derbend, stirred up trouble in Arrān and later the Georgians, perhaps enraged at the failure of their new offer of an alliance, sacked Bailakān (*ibid.*, p. 266). Towards the end of the year (Oct. 1222), we find Uzbek again inactive at Tabrīz but he must have had a certain amount of influence, for an amīr of Mawṣil 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 Khwārizmshāh Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his uncle Ighan-taisi; Uzbek, accom-

panied by his slave Aibek al-Shāmi, marched against Ghiyāth al-Dīn but was defeated (Ibn al-Athīr, xii. 270). According to Nasawī, p. 76, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, when he had established himself in the 'Irāk, undertook operations against Ādharbāidjān (Marāgha, Udjān) and Uzbek endeavoured to pacify him by giving him in marriage his sister, the princess of Nakhičawān; on the other hand, Ighan-taisi twice came and pillaged Ādharbāidjān (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, xii. 281).

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

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

Arrival of Djalāl al-Dīn. Before the approach of Djalāl al-Dīn, Uzbek withdrew to Gandja while a Khwārizmī commander was admitted into Tabrīz. On the 16th Rādjab 622 (June 24, 1225), Djalāl al-Dīn occupied the town.

During the absence of Djalāl al-Dīn in Georgia, a plot was hatched at Tabrīz to bring back Uzbek, in which so important a man as Shams al-Dīn Tughrā'i took part, but Djalāl al-Dīn arrived in time to check it. The Khwārizmshāh dealt Uzbek a blow, which he felt deeply, by marrying his wife, the daughter of Tughrīl 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 Djalāl al-Dīn and she finally appealed to the Aiyūbid Malik Ashraf and the latter in 624 sent an expedition to Ādharbāidjān which brought the princess to Khilāt (Ibn al-Athīr p. 307; Nasawī, p. 154).

Gandja also was lost to Uzbek and he spent his last days (622 = 1225) in the fortress of Alindja (cf. Minorsky, *Transcaucasia*, in *J.A.*, 1930, July, p. 93) overwhelmed by his misfortunes and humiliations (cf. Nasawī, p. 119; Djuwainī, ii. 157). With him ended the rule of the Atābeks descended from Ildegiz (Eldigüz).

Uzbek left one son whose name seems to have been Kīzīl Arslān (Nasawī, p. 168, contrary to the *Rāhat al-Ṣudūr*, p. 393, where he is called Tughrīl), but he was generally known as Khāmūsh ("the silent") for he was deaf and dumb (cf. Nasawī, p. 129 - 130; *Djahūn-gushā*, ii. 248).

Uzbek is very severely judged by the historians. Ibn al-Athīr, 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-kumār bi 'l-baid*, "the game of eggs"). The Atābek led an indolent life and for months never left his home (cf. also Yāqūt, s. v. Urmiya, i. 219). This gloomy picture must have been a contrast to the hopes which at this time Muslims were placing on Djalāl al-Dīn who, however, was by no means free from vice in his private life (Nasawī, p. 186,

243—244). In his youth Uzbek had taken part in several expeditions, but his forces were insufficient to meet the attacks of serious (the Georgians were then at the height of their power; cf. TIFLIS) or redoubtable enemies (the Mongols and the great warrior Djalāl al-Dīn).

Ibn al-Aṭhīr, xii. 281, mentions at Tabriz a kiosk built at great expense by Uzbek. The court of the bon vivant Atābek attracted poets and artists. Uzbek's vizier Rabīb al-Dīn was a great patron of letters (Nasawī, p. 162—163 and the conclusion of the *Marzubān-nāma*).

Bibliography: Rāwandī, *Rāhat al-Ṣudūr*, G.M.S., cf. the index; Ibn al-Aṭhīr, xii., cf. the index; Nasawī, *Sīrat Djalāl al-Dīn*, ed. Houdas, cf. the index. — The history of the Saldjūks *Akhbār al-Dawlat al-Saldjūkiya*: Rieu, *Suppl. to the Catalogue of the Arabic Mss.*, No. 550 (which contains some details of the Atābeks) still awaits an editor; cf. Süsseim, *Prolegomena zu einer Ausgabe der "Chronik des Seldschugischen Reiches"*, Leipzig 1911; Mirkhond, *Histoire des Sultans du Kharezm*, ed. with notes by Defrémery, Paris 1842, p. 108 sqq.; Khondamīr, *Ḥabīb al-Siyar*, ii.—iv., Tīhrān 1271, p. 201 (of no importance); Müneddjim-baṣḥī, *Ṣaḥā'if al-Akhbār*, ii. 581 (minor note); Defrémery, *Recherches sur quatre princes d'Hamadan*, in *J. A.*, 1847, ix., p. 148—186 (excellent article on the government of the Mamlūks Kōkčā, Ay-toghmiṣ, Māngli and Aghlamish). (V. MINORSKY).

UZUN ḤASAN, a ruler of the Turkoman dynasty of the Aḳ-Ḳoyunlu (the founder of the dynasty was Bāyandur), prince of Diyār Bakr from 858, and then (872—882) sovereign of a powerful state comprising Armenia, Mesopotamia and Persia. The stature of Ḥasan Beg b. 'Alī Beg b. Ḳara 'Oṭhmān (= Ḳara Ilāḳ?, reading uncertain), earned him the nickname of Uzun (= "the long").

The reign of Uzun Ḥasan is very important but not well known.

Rivalries of the Turkoman tribes. The original fief of the chiefs of the house of Bāyandur and of their Turkoman tribe "of the White Sheep" (Aḳ-Ḳoyunlu) was in Diyār Bakr (from before the period of Tīmūr). From there they spread to the west, north and east. At first the chief rivals of the Aḳ-Ḳoyunlu were the Ḳara-Ḳoyunlu Turkomans and this rivalry was accentuated by religious differences, for the Aḳ-Ḳoyunlu were Sunnīs and the Ḳara-Ḳoyunlu Shī'īs (and extremely heterodox).

Ḳara 'Oṭhmān, an adventurous and energetic individual, died in 838 (1434—1435). His son 'Alī Beg spent his reign fighting with his brother Ḥamza against whom he sought the support of the Ottoman Sultān Murād II and Sultān Čaḳmaḳ of Egypt. After the death of the two brothers, Djihāngīr, son of 'Alī, resumed the struggle against the Ḳara-Ḳoyunlu but offended his brother Uzun Ḥasan, his uncle Kāsim Beg [whom v. Hammer, i. 506 calls Ḥasan] and the governor of Erzindjān, Ḳllīdj Arslān b. Pīr 'Alī. In spite of his quarrel with Djihāngīr, Uzun Ḥasan defeated his two adversaries and then conquered the "greater number" of the begs of Kurdistān. Having learned that Djihāngīr had set out for the summer encampments on the Ala-dagh (this name probably refers to the ancient Masius, a mountain between Diyār Bakr and Mārdīn), Ḥasan penetrated into the fortress of Diyār Bakr (Āmid) in disguise while Djihāngīr

was forced to shut himself up in Mārdīn [q. v.]. This took place in 858 (1454) and soon Ḥasan occupied Ruhā and laid siege to Mārdīn (cf. 'Āshīḳ-pāshā-zāde, p. 247—249; Müneddjim-baṣḥī, iii. 157).

The intervention of Ḥasan's mother, a female diplomat who played a great part in later developments, forced Uzun Ḥasan to return to Diyār Bakr. He sought to recompense himself by a raid on Ḳara-Ḳoyunlu territory (Erzerum, Awnik, Baiburt) but having failed to take Erzindjān returned to Diyār Bakr.

On resuming the siege of Erzindjān, Uzun Ḥasan fell from his horse and was seriously injured. Djihāngīr seized the opportunity to sack the environs of Āmid but on Ḥasan's return sought refuge with the Ḳara-Ḳoyunlu Djihān-Shāh. His mother once more installed Ḥasan in Diyār Bakr and Djihāngīr in Mārdīn. The struggle was very soon resumed on a larger scale. Ḥasan marched on Erzindjān and Turdjān, from which he drove 'Arab-Shāh, his brother's representative, and then attacked Ḳhurāsān and Ḳarāja-Dagh (S. W. of Diyār Bakr). The Ḳara-Ḳoyunlu Djihān-Shāh sent his amīrs to the help of Djihāngīr but Uzun Ḥasan defeated them in 861 (May 1457?; cf. Ibn Taghrībirdī, ed. Popper, vii. 485). Djihāngīr gave his son as a hostage, and another brother of Ḥasan (Uwais of Ruhā) also submitted to him. Uzun Ḥasan installed the amīr Ḳhurshīd Beg (perhaps his cousin; cf. Müneddjim-baṣḥī, iii. 376) in Erzindjān. This fortress was the key to the Armenian plateau. About the same time, Ḥasan gave shelter to the Ḳara-Ḳoyunlu Ḥasan 'Alī who had rebelled against his father Djihān-Shāh, 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 Ḥasan and the extension of his influence over the neighbouring lands.

Operations in Kurdistān. On the Tigris he took Ḥiṣn Kaifā from the Kurd maliks descended from the Aiyubids (cf. *Sharaf-nāma*, ii. 149—155) and gave this fortress to his son Ḳhalīl. Sī'irt and Haitham (in Bohtān) were later occupied (cf. also *Sharaf-nāma*, ii. 9).

Uzun Ḥasan between Ḳaramān and Trebizond. In the west, the successes of Uzun Ḥasan brought him into conflict with the Ottomans who under the leadership of Muḥammad II had just completed the subjection of the feudal principalities of Asia Minor. The princes of Ḳaramān [q. v.], gravely threatened by the Ottomans, endeavoured to enter into an alliance with their eastern neighbour Uzun Ḥasan. On the other hand, Uzun Ḥasan 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 Uzun Ḥasan 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, *Očerki po istorii Trapez. imperii*, Leningrad 1929).

The embassies sent by Uzun Ḥasan to Constantinople in 1457 and 1460 revealed to the Sultān

Tunisie, Cahors 1927 (Toulouse, Th. dr.); E. Fitoussi and A. Benazet, *L'état Tunisien et le protectorat Français*, Paris 1931, ii. 393 sq. — Algiers: E. Larcher, *Traité élémentaire de législation algérienne*³, Paris 1923, iii. 203—213; J. Terras, *Essai sur les biens habous en Algérie et en Tunisie*, Lyons 1899 (with earlier literature); Hacoun, *Étude sur l'évolution des coutumes Kabyles spéc. en ce qui concerne l'cx-hérédation des femmes et la pratique des Hobous*, Algiers 1921 (Th. dr.); M. Mercier, *Étude sur le wakf Abadhite et ses applications au Mزاب*, Algiers 1927 (Th. dr.). — Morocco: Michaux-Bellaire und Graulle, *Les Habous de Tanger*, in *A. M.*, xxii.—xxiii.; I. Milliot, *Démembrements du Habous*, Paris 1918; A. Mesureur, *La propriété foncière au Maroc*, Paris 1921, p. 53 sqq., 75 sqq.; P. L. Rivière, *Traité, codes et lois du Maroc*, Paris 1925, iii. 839 sqq.

(HEFFENING)

WAKHĀN (in Arabic *Wakhkhān*), a district to the south of the Pāmīr [q. v.]. *Wakhān* is a long and narrow valley which runs from east to west and is watered by the upper course of the Oxus (Pandja) and by the river *Wakhān-daryā*, which is the most southern source of the Oxus [cf. *AMŪ-DARYĀ*]. The length of *Wakhān* along the Oxus is 67 miles and of the *Wakhān-daryā* (from Langar-kish to the *Wakhdjir* pass) 113 miles, Afghan sources put the distance from *Ishkashim* to Sarhadd at 66 *kurōh* = 22 farsakhs.

To the south of *Wakhān* rises the wall of the Hindū-Kush through which several passes lead to the lands of the upper Indus. The main pass (12,460 feet) of Baroghil leads into Citrāl. The northern wall of *Wakhān* is the *Wakhān* (Nicolas II) range the peaks of which reach a height of 23,000 feet. In the west *Wakhān* stretches to the bend of the Oxus, where the river entering the boundaries of *Shughnān* [q. v.] turns northwards. In the east *Wakhān* (through the high valley of *Wakhdjir*) is adjoined by Chinese possessions and lake Čakmak-tŋg.

Wakhān lies as a barrier between Russian lands in the north and British in the south so that nowhere are they in direct contact. By the Russo-Afghan agreement of March 4, 1895 defining the frontier, it runs *a.* in the lower part of *Wakhān* up the course of the Oxus as far as Langar-kish where the two sources of the Oxus meet: the river *Wakhān* from S. E. (from the Little Pāmīr) and the river Pāmīr from the N. E. (from the Great Pāmīr); *b.* from Langar-kish the frontier follows the course of the Pāmīr river to its source (lake Zor-kul or Victoria); *c.* more to the east again, the frontier runs by a zigzag line towards the south to China (near the Beyik pass). Afghan territory therefore comprises the left bank of the Oxus, all the valley of the *Wakhān-daryā*, the land on the left bank of the Pāmīr river and a small part of the upper course of the Aḳ-su (including lake Čakmak-kul).

The Afghan part of *Wakhān* contains seven districts, namely from west to east: Warg, Ūrgand, *Khandūd*, *Ḳal'a-yi Pandja*, *Bābā-Tangī*, *Nirs-wa-Shalak* and *Sarhadd* (this last named village is at the foot of the Baroghil pass at a height of 11,350 feet), as well as the thinly populated territory of the Little Pāmīr (watered by the *Wakhān-daryā*).

On the Afghan side there are in *Wakhān* 64 villages with 3,500 inhabitants and on the Russian

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

In his monumental works Sir Aurel Stein supports the thesis according to which the *Wakhān* 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, *Wakhān* is continually mentioned in the early Chinese sources under the names of Hu-mī, Po-ho etc. (cf. Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, p. 243, and Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, Index). Hiuen Tsang mentions the greenish eyes of the people of Ta-mo-si-t'ie-ti (a form not yet satisfactorily explained) and its capital Hun-t'o-to (= *Khandūd*) with its great Buddhist *vihāra*. In 747 *Wakhān* had become the theatre of the operations of the famous Chinese general Kao-sien-če against the Tibetans (cf. Chavannes, p. 152—153). Among Arab authors, *Iṣṭakhri* (< *Balkhī*) several times mentions *Wakhān* as a land of infidels, as the place from which musk comes and where the Oxus rises (cf. *Iṣṭakhri*, p. 279, 280, 296; Ibn Rusta, p. 91). Mas'ūdī, *Murūdj*, i. 213; *Tanbih*, p. 64, applies the term "Türk" to all the inhabitants of the upper Oxus: the *Awkhān* (اوخان, read: *وخان*), Tubbat (Tibetans) and *Ayghān* (?). As to the Iranian *Wakhīs* the term "Türk" can only refer to their dynasty (cf. Marquart, *Währöt und Arang* [still unpublished], p. 101—102). More detailed information is supplied by the Persian geographical work *Hudūd al-'Ālam* (372 = 982, ed. Barthold, 1930, fol. 25^b) which calls *Wakhān* the residence of the king and capital of the land (*shahr*) of *Sikāshim* (it ought probably to be emended to **Ishkashim*, the capital of *Wakhān*!). At *Kh-mdādh* (**Khundād*) are the temples (*but-khāna*) of the *Wakhīs* and "to its left" was a fortress occupied by the Tibetans. *Samarkandāk* is regarded as the remotest frontier of the dependencies of Transoxiana; it had Hindu, Tibetan and *Wakhī* inhabitants (probably the *Sarhadd* of the present day).

Bibliography: Cf. the articles *PĀMĪR* and *SHUGHNĀN*. Curzon, *The Pamirs*, reprint of 1898, p. 32 and the map; Comte Bobrinskoy, *Gortsĭ verkhoviev Pandja*, Moscow 1908; Prince Masalsky, *Turkestan*, 1913, p. 99—102 (vol. xix. of the series *Russie* by P. P. Semenov); *Tadjikistān*, Tashkent 1925, *passim* (collection of memoirs by Korzenewsky, Barthold, Semenov, etc. on the Soviet Republic of Tadjikistān); Burhān al-Dīn Khān Khūshkaki, *Kattaghan wa-Badakhshān*, Russ. transl., Tashkent 1926, p. 149—170; Sir A. Stein, *Serindia*, 1921, vol. i., chap. iii., p. 60—71 (old Chinese references); do., *Innermost Asia*, 1928, ii. 863—871 (antiquities: Zangibār near Hiṣār, Zamr-i ātash-parast near Yamčīn); do., *On ancient Tracks past the Pamirs*, in *The Himalayan Journal*, iv., 1932 (special print, p. 1—26). — On the *Wakhī* language cf. Geiger in the *Grundriss d. iran. Phil.*, i/ii., p. 290 sqq., and Grierson, *Linguistic Survey of India*, x. (1921), 457—65. (V. MINORSKY).