

songhay, Paris 1975; H.T. Norris, *Sanhajah scholars of Tombuctoo*, in *BSOAS*, xxx (1967), 635-40; M. Zouber, *Aḥmad Bābū de Tombouctou (1556-1627): sa vie et son oeuvre*, Paris 1977; Abitbol, *Tombouctou et les Arma*, Paris 1979; Muḥammad al-Ḡharbī, *Bidāyat al-hukm al-maghribī fi 'l-sūdān al-ḡharbī*, n.p. [Baghdād] 1982; Elias N. Saad, *Social history of Timbuktu*, Cambridge 1983; Elizabeth Hodgkin, *Social and political relations in the Niger Bend in the seventeenth century*, doctoral diss. Univ. of Birmingham 1987, unpubl.; M.A. Gomez, *Timbuktu under imperial Songhay: a reconsideration of autonomy*, in *J. African Hist.*, xxxi (1990), 5-24; J.O. Hunwick, *A contribution to the study of Islamic teaching traditions in West Africa: the career of Muḥammad Baghayogho, 930/1523-4—1002/1594*, in *Islam et sociétés au Sud du Sahara*, iv (1990), 149-63; idem, *An Andalusian in Mali: a contribution to the biography of Abū Ishāq al-Sāhili, c. 1290-1346*, in *Paideuma*, xxxvi (1990), 59-66; idem, *Secular power and religious authority in Islam: the case of Songhay*, in *J. African Hist.*, xxxvii/2 (1996), 175-94. (J.O. HUNWICK)

TIMSĀḤ (A., pl. *tamāsīḥ*), masculine substantive denoting the Nile crocodile (*Crocodilus vulgaris*) of the class of reptiles (*zaghāfāt*) and the order of saurians (*ʿaḡāliyyāt*); it is the only crocodile known in the Arabophone countries. The name appears to be derived from the Coptic *ʿimsah*.

According to ancient authors, this crocodile is said to have been formerly present in the waters of the Jordan and the Euphrates. A carnivore, it devours all kinds of meat and fish. Of naturalists writing in the Arabic language, al-Damīrī (see *Bibl.*) is the only one to have dealt at length with the crocodile; he mentions all of its particular features, most of his information being borrowed from Aristotle (see *Bibl.*). The crocodile has as its avowed enemies the lion, the hippopotamus (*faras al-māʾ*), the otter (*kalb al-māʾ*) and the weasel (*ibn ʿirs*); the latter gains access to the interior of the crocodile's belly by way of the open mouth, and devours its liver. The only effective defensive weapon at the crocodile's disposal is the violent thrashing of its tail, which can fell a man or an ox. It spends most of the time submerged; however, being oviparous it leaves the water to lay its eggs in soft soil and cover them.

In Islamic law, the consumption of the flesh of the crocodile is formally prohibited, the animal being a carnivore.

On the other hand, this saurian presents several specific qualities. Thus one of its eyes worn by a rheumy-eyed person (*ramad*) cures him rapidly, whether this be the left eye for the left or the right for the right. To carry one of its teeth about one's person has an aphrodisiac effect and, if it is from the left side, it dispels any kind of shivers (*kashāʾirir*). Its fat is a beneficial ointment for treating otitis and its gall makes an effective eye-wash for the treatment of albugo. When dried, pulverised and used in fumigation, its liver alleviates epilepsy (*sarʿ*) and its dung, extracted from the intestine and applied as a lotion to the affected skin of the leper (*bayāḍ*), makes the disease disappear. In spite of all this, the crocodile remains, in the opinion of most, an exceedingly harmful beast, as is shown by expressions such as *azlam min timsāḥ* "more tyrannical than a crocodile". As against this, there is a small bird which profits by association with the aquatic monster, this being the Egyptian plover (*Phasianus aegyptius*) called *ṭayr al-timsāḥ* "crocodile bird" and also known as *saksāk*, *zakzāk* or *tawram*; it enters the open mouth of the saurian and, with its sharp-pointed beak, feeds on the morsels of meat stuck between the teeth.

In botany, there is the *ḥabka al-timsāḥ* "crocodile basil" which is the common calamint (*Clinopodium vulgare* or *Calamintha clinopodium*), a labiate member of the *Melissa* genus.

In oniromancy, seeing a crocodile in a dream presages the defeat of an enemy.

Bibliography: Aristotle, *Histoire des animaux*, tr. J. Tricot, Paris 1957, i, 130-1 and *passim*; Damīrī, *Hayāt al-hayawān al-kubrā*, Cairo 1937, i, 163-4; Dr. Chenu, *Encyclopédie d'histoire naturelle*, Paris 1874, vol. *Reptiles et poissons*, 45-50; A. Malouf (Amīn al-Maʿlūf), *Muʿjam al-hayawān. An Arabic zoological dictionary*, Cairo 1932, 76, s.v. Crocodile; H. Eisenstein, *Einführung in die arabische Zoographie*, Berlin 1990, index s.v. Krokodil. (F. VIRÉ)

TIMSĀḤ, Lake, one of the series of swamps and lagoons in the Eastern Nile Delta region of Egypt (now administratively in the *muḥāfaẓa* of Ismāʿīliyya) through which the Suez Canal passes on its way from Port Saʿīd south to Suez. The Canal enters the Lake at the 80th kilometre. On the northern shore lies the town of Ismāʿīliyya [q.v.]. The Lake is about 6 sq. miles in area, although before the construction of the Canal it was brackish and reedy. Now it is very picturesque, with its bright blue waters and the background of desert hills. The name means "Crocodile Lake" [see the preceding art.], being once upon a time the haunt of that creature. Archaeologists are undecided as to the part it played in historic times. Wallis Budge (*Hist. of Egypt*, v, 131-2) supposes that it was somewhere in its neighbourhood that the Israelites crossed during their flight from Egypt. He identifies it with the *yam-sūp* or Sea of Reeds mentioned in Exod., xiii. 18.

Bibliography: ʿAlī Mubārak, *al-Khiṭaṭ al-djādida*, viii, 46; S.W. Baker, *Ismailia*, i, 190; E.A.W. Budge, *Cook's Handbook for Egypt and the Sūdān*, London 1911, 403; Baedeker, *Egypt*, Leipzig 1929, 191, 198. (J. WALKER)

TIMTHĀL [SEC ŠANAM].

TİMÜR LANG ("Timur the Lame") b. Taragḡay Barlas, the founder of the Tīmūrid dynasty [q.v.] which ruled in Central Asia and eastern Iran from 1370 to 1507. The birthdate commonly ascribed to Tīmūr, 25 Šaʿbān 736/8 April 1336, is probably an invention from the time of his successor Šāh Rukḡ [q.v.], the day chosen for astrological meaning and the year to coincide with the death of the last Il-Khān (Manz, *Tamerlane and the symbolism of sovereignty*, in *Iranian Studies*, xxi/1-2 [1988], 113-14 n.) Tīmūr rose to power in the Ulus Čaġhatay, a tribal confederation forming the western section of the Mongol Čaġhatay Khānate [q.v.] He was a member of the Barlas of the Kish region. This was an important Mongol tribe within the Ulus, tracing its leadership back to Činggis Khān's commander Ƙaračar, who shared a common ancestor with Činggis, and was later attached to his son Čaġhatay. Tīmūr descended from Ƙaračar but was not of the chiefly lineage, and gained power through skilful politics and the help of a personal, non-tribal following.

1. His career.

The histories first mention Tīmūr on the invasion of the Eastern Čaġhatayid Khān Tughluq Tīmūr in Rabīʿ II 761/February-March 1360. Hādjdjī Beg, chief of the Barlas, fled the Ulus, and Tīmūr obtained appointment to his place. He forged an alliance with Amīr Ḥusayn Ƙaraʿunas, nephew of the former tribal ruler of the Ulus. During the next ten years Tīmūr campaigned and intrigued, first in alliance with Ḥusayn against the Eastern Čaġhatayids, and after Ḥusayn's

seizure of the Ulus in 767/1366, usually in competition with Husayn. He frequently had to take refuge in *Khurāsān* and *Māzandarān*. According to contemporary histories, it was at one of these times, in a campaign for the kings of *Sīstān*, that Tīmūr received the wound which deformed his right arm, but examination of his skeleton suggests that this was in part due to illness.

In 771/1369 Tīmūr gathered the tribal aristocracy behind him and defeated and killed *Sultān Husayn*. Since he was not descended from *Činggis Khān*, Tīmūr ruled through a puppet *khān* from the *Ögedeyid* branch, while posing as an upholder of the *Čaghatayid* order. He took for himself a *Činggisid* wife (*Saray Malik*) and assumed the title of *güregen* "royal son-in-law", making his capital at *Samarqand*, which he embellished and fortified. On 12 *Ramaḍān* 771/9 April 1370 he had his government formally reaffirmed by the members of the *Ulus Čaghatay*. Nonetheless, he found the tribal leaders of the *Ulus* quick to react against any assertion of power. For the first twelve years of his reign he suffered numerous tribal uprisings and desertions, which he put down largely without force, especially in his first years of rule.

Tīmūr soon began to lead his armies outside the *Ulus Čaghatay*. In 772-3/1370-2 he began campaigning in the *Farghānā* Valley, and over the next several years gradually expanded his claims into the Eastern *Čaghatayid* regions, where the seizure of power by tribal leaders in 1369 offered opportunities for interference. By 777/1375 he had installed a governor in *Andīdžān*, and in 779/1377-8, in *Kāshghar*. These claims required effort to maintain, and Tīmūr stretched his forays as far as the *Irtys* and *Yulduz*. Tīmūr's first attack on *Kh̲w̲ārazm* came in 773-4/1372-3, after its ruler refused to cede to him the cities of *Kat̲h̲* and *Kh̲iwa*, to which he laid claim. This also embroiled Tīmūr in a set of continuing campaigns, culminating in the seizure and sack of *Urganč* in 789/1387.

In 777/1376 Tīmūr espoused the cause of *Tokhtamish* or *Toktamish* [*q.v.*], a pretender to the throne of the *Djočid* Blue (or in some sources, White) Horde north of the *Syr Darya*, and helped him to power in 778/1377. By 1382, *Tokhtamish* had taken control over the *Golden Horde* with the *Russian* lands, and re-imposed tribute over *Lithuania*. During this time, Tīmūr was active in *Persia*. In 782/1380 he appointed his third son, *Mīrān Shāh* [*q.v.*] governor of *Khurāsān*, and in winter 1380-1, began his *Persian* campaigns. Over the next years, Tīmūr campaigned in *Khurāsān*, *Sīstān* and in *Māzandarān*. In *Shawwāl* 786/Nov.-Dec. 1384, he took *Māzandarān* and re-installed *Luḡmān b. Toghāy* Tīmūr, last of the pretenders to the *Il-Khānid* throne (though descended from *Činggis Khān's* brother). From here Tīmūr proceeded to the *Il-Khānid* city of *Sultāniyya*.

It seems likely that Tīmūr was aiming at a restoration of the *Mongol Empire*; he had by now collected three *Činggisid khāns* beneath him (as he hoped): an *Ögedeyid* puppet *khān*, and "clients" from the *Djočid* and *Il-Khānid* *Uluses*. *Tokhtamish*, however, now revived the *Golden Horde-Il-Khānid* rivalry, attacking *Tabriz* in winter 787/1385-6. The duel between the two men lasted almost ten years. In spring 788/1386 Tīmūr set out for his "Three-year campaign" to *Luristān*, *Ādharbaydžān* and the *Caucasus*. When *Tokhtamish* again prepared to attack *Ādharbaydžān* in early 789/1387, Tīmūr's army defeated him; Tīmūr then campaigned against the *Turkmen* *Qara Qoyunlu* [*q.v.*] and the *Muzaffarid* [*q.v.*] dynasty

of *Fārs*. At the end of 789/1387 he learned that *Tokhtamish* had pillaged *Transoxania* and gained the support of the *Kh̲w̲ārazmian* local dynasty and the Eastern *Čaghatayids*. Tīmūr spent the next four years campaigning in the east. In autumn 792/1390 he set out for a major offensive against *Tokhtamish*, and in June 793/1391 defeated him on the *Kondurcha* River near *Samara*. By 1394 *Tokhtamish* had recovered the *Golden Horde*, again forming an alliance with the *Mamlūks* against Tīmūr, and in autumn 796/1394 he raided *Ādharbaydžān*. Tīmūr counter-attacked and soundly defeated him on the *Terek* River on 23 *Djumaḍā* II 797/15 April 1395. He waged a systematic campaign of destruction in the *Don* and *Volga* regions up to *Yelets*, pillaging trading cities and nomad centres; *Tokhtamish* could not again challenge Tīmūr's power.

During this period, Tīmūr also campaigned in *Persia*. On 6 *Ramaḍān* 794/27 July 1392 he began his "Five-year campaign". In spring 795/1393 he destroyed the *Muzaffarid* dynasty, and put southern *Persia* under his son *ʿUmar Shaykh*. He appointed *Mīrān Shāh* as governor of western *Persia* and set out to wrest the region from the *Djalāyirids* of *Baghdād* and the *Qara Qoyunlu*. The *Aq Qoyunlu* [*q.v.*], less powerful, he recruited as allies, and this started their rise to power. In summer 798/1396 Tīmūr returned to *Samarqand* and spent about a year there, then in spring, 800/1398 he went against *India*, sacking and burning *Dihlī* in *Rabīʿ II* 801/December 1398.

In the spring of 801/1399, Tīmūr returned to *Samarqand*, and in early 802/September 1399 set out for his "Seven-year campaign" to the west. He reasserted his power in *Georgia* and *Baghdād*, and again fought the *Qara Qoyunlu*. Tīmūr's involvement in the politics of the *Arab*, *Kurdish* and *Turkmen* dynasties of eastern *Anatolia* had brought him into conflict with the *Mamlūks* and *Ottomans*. Since 1395 he had been considering war against the former. At that time, he had still been friendly with the *Ottoman* sultan *Bāyezīd I* [*q.v.*], but relations changed in 800/1398 with the deaths of the *Mamlūk* sultan *Barkūk* and of the *Kādī* *Burhān al-Dīn*, ruler of *Sīwās* (*Z.V. Togan*, *Timurs Osteuropapolitik*, in *ZDMG*, cviii [1958], 279-98). The resulting confusion attracted both Tīmūr and *Bāyezīd*, and their relations as a result rapidly deteriorated. In autumn to winter 803/1400-1 Tīmūr campaigned in *Syria*, after the *Mamlūks* had murdered his ambassadors and given refuge to his enemies. In spring 804/1402 he set out against the *Ottomans*, whom he defeated near *Ankara* on 19 *Dhu l-Hiḍḍja* 804/20 July 1402. He took *Yıldırım Bāyezīd* captive but treated him well. His armies campaigned through the *Ottoman* territories, collecting tribute from their cities, but left the *Ottoman* dynasty in place.

Tīmūr now returned to *Samarqand*, where he staged a major convocation (*kuriltay* [*q.v.*]), attended by foreign ambassadors, including the *Spanish* ambassador *Ruy Gonzáles de Clavijo*. Chinese ambassadors were also present, but were publicly humiliated. In late autumn 807/1404 he set out with an enormous army against *China*, planning to winter in *Utrār*, but died there on the eve of 17 *Shaʿbān* 807/18 February 1405.

2. The method and purpose of his campaigns.

The *Turco-Mongolian* population of the *Ulus Čaghatay*, known as *Čaghatays*, formed the core of Tīmūr's army, decimally ordered and led by his family and personal following. He also levied contingents from the regions he conquered, whom he used in campaigns close to their place of origin. Thus the

composition of Tīmūr's army changed and conformed to the needs of specific expeditions. As Tīmūr appointed his sons and followers governors over new dominions, he assigned armies to them, each containing commanders from a variety of tribes and from the families of Tīmūr's personal followers.

Taking Činggis Khān as model, Tīmūr offered a choice of submission with safety or complete destruction; he carried off the skilled artisans and spared the religious classes, sometimes amusing himself by matching them in disputation and in chess. Even from submissive cities he extorted a massive ransom. His campaigns included displays of spectacular ferocity, sparingly used, and almost always intentional. The ravages of his army were considerable but frequently followed by the restoration of agriculture. On his first expedition to a region, Tīmūr simply extracted submission and taxes, returning later to punish insubordinate vassals and install governors. He destroyed only the larger dynasties within his dominions, notably the Karts [q.v.] of Harāt and the Muzaffarids [q.v.] of Fars; small dynasties continued in place, providing hostages and troops.

Tīmūr incorporated only part of his conquered territory into his domains, sc. regions combining a strong agricultural base and largely Persian-speaking population with a significant nomad Turco-Mongolian stratum. This corresponded approximately to the Il-Khānid and western Čaghatayid territories. Tīmūr may originally have intended to restore the entire Mongol empire, and have changed his mind when he found steppe regions more difficult to control and less rewarding financially than settled ones. By the mid-1390s, he had probably decided not to incorporate the steppe into his domain; he chose simply to destroy the cities of the Golden Horde and to leave the nominal rulership to a Djočid protégé, whom he left without support. Tīmūr's campaigns into regions outside the Mongol empire seem to have been aimed to show that he was supreme also within the Islamic world. He installed no administration in India, Syria or Anatolia. One region Tīmūr tried to hold and failed, Ādharbaydžān, was ruled by Turkmen nomads whom he could defeat but not destroy. Although it was nominally within Tīmūr's realm, he held it only briefly.

3. The organisation of Tīmūr's realm.

Tīmūr installed a *diwān* system on the model of earlier nomad dynasties, but during his lifetime it was probably not highly articulated. Persian bureaucrats appear to have held rather low status, especially in central government. The central *diwān* (*diwān-i alā*), responsible for financial administration, was staffed largely with Persians, but Čaghatay *amīrs* were also active within it. Provincial governors were either princes or close followers; city governors (*darūghās* [q.v.]) were appointed personally by Tīmūr from among his followers or tribesmen. Tīmūr controlled his governors through periodic changes in provincial appointment, and by demanding their presence on campaigns.

In 805/1403 he reorganised his dominions into four sections, each under the family of one of his sons: Mīrān Shāh's family in the west; 'Umar Shaykh's sons in southern and central Persia; Djahāngīr's son in the southeast; and Shāh Rukh with his sons in Khurāsān and the regions to the east and north. In planning for succession, Tīmūr favoured the line of his second son, Djahāngīr, born of a free wife, but he died early; later, Tīmūr appointed as successor Djahāngīr's son by a Činggisid wife, Muḥammad Sulṭān. Muḥammad Sulṭān died in 805/1403, and it was not until just

before his own death that Tīmūr appointed Pīr Muḥammad b. Djahāngīr, who failed to take power.

4. Foreign relations.

Tīmūr maintained active relations with both neighbouring and distant states. His initial contacts with China were friendly; in October 1394 his ambassadors arrived at the Chinese court with a letter whose Chinese version expressed submission. The Chinese reply of 1395 alerted Tīmūr, however, to the Emperor's understanding of the relationship. He detained the ambassadors, and from this time remained unfriendly to China, beginning as early as 800/1398 to plan a campaign against it. The same year, he welcomed a pretender from the dynasty of the Northern Yüan, who remained in his following, making up part of his projected China expedition in 807/1405.

Common enmity to the Ottomans attracted Tīmūr and the Christian powers, and during his later years he exchanged embassies with the Paleologi rulers of Constantinople, the Venetians, Henry IV of England, the Genoese of Ghalāṭa, Charles VI of France, Martin I of Aragon and Catalonia, and finally Henry III of Castile and León, whose ambassador, Ruy Gonzáles de Clavijo, has left a valuable record of his embassy to Samarqand in 1404-6.

5. Literary and artistic patronage.

Tīmūr was an active patron of religion, monumental architecture and historical writing. He had both Šūfīs and 'ulamā' in his suite; in belief, he was Sunni, with a strong reverence for the family of the Prophet. In architecture, Tīmūr favoured the monumental. In 771/1370 he began to turn Samarqand into a royal capital, and about 775/1373-4 he started building at his second capital of Kish (Shahr-i Sabz) [q.v.], adding fortifications, and the Aḳ Sarāy palace in 781/1379-80 after his conquest of Khwārazm, whose craftsmen he transported to work there. He continued his building programme in Samarqand, erecting garden palaces around the city, many designed for his wives. After his decisive defeat of Tokhtamīsh, Tīmūr undertook more grandiose building projects, including the shrine complex for Aḥmad Yasawī [q.v.] in Yāsī/Turkistān in 799/1396-7, and, on his return from India, the huge Masǧid-i Džāmī' (the Bībī Khānum). After his campaign against the Mamlūks and Ottomans, he ordered the building of canals and a bazaar at his winter quarters of Karabāgh, and apparently a new bazaar for Samarqand (Clavijo, *Narrative of the Spanish Embassy to the court of Timur at Samarqand in the years 1403-1406*, tr. G. Le Strange, London 1928, 278). It is notable that, during Tīmūr's lifetime, the patronage of large-scale architecture was reserved for him, royal women, and his heir-apparent Muḥammad Sulṭān.

Tīmūr also commissioned historical writing. Ibn Khaldūn, who met him, considered him highly knowledgeable in this area. Sources mention several contemporary chronicles of his reign, prose and verse, Turkic and Persian, most now lost. One commissioned work survives: the *Zafar-nāma* of Nizām al-Dīn Shāmī [q.v.], completed in 1404, which served as a major source for later Tīmūrid historians. Tīmūr's "memoirs", the *Tuzūk-i tīmūrī*, are a later fabrication.

Tīmūr's concern for his reputation was well rewarded, and he was remembered for centuries as a supremely charismatic figure, still invoked for legitimisation in the 18th century by Nādir Shāh Afshār, and in the 19th by the Ming dynasty of Khokand.

Bibliography: 1. Primary Sources. Faṣīḥ Kh'āfi, *Muǧmal-i faṣīḥī*, ed. Muḥammad Farrukh, Mashhad 1960-1; Ibn 'Arabshāh, *Aǧā'ib al-maǧdūr*

fī akhbār Tīmūr, ed. A.M. 'Umar, Cairo 1399/1979, tr. J.H. Sanders, *Tamerlane or Timur the Great Amir*, London 1936; John of Sultaniyya, *Mémoire sur Tamerlan et sa cour par un Dominicain, en 1403*, ed. H. Moran-villé, in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, lv, Paris 1894, 433-64; Ibn Khaldūn, partial ed. and tr. W.J. Fischel, *Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane. Their historic meeting in Damascus, 1401 A.D. (803 A.H.)*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1952; anon., *Mu'izz al-ansāb fī shadhārat al-ansāb*, mss., see Storey, i, 298; Mu'in al-Dīn Natanzi, *Extraits du Muntakhab al-tavārikh-i mu'inī* (*Anonym d'Iskandar*), ed. J. Aubin, Tehran 1957; 'Abd al-Husayn Nawā'i, *Asnād wa mukātabāt-i tārikh-i Irān*, Tehran 1977; Nizām al-Dīn Shāmī, *Histoire des conquêtes de Tamerlan intitulée Zafarnāma, par Nizāmuddīn Samī*, ed. F. Tauer, Prague 1937-56; Ghiyāth al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī, *Rūz-nāma-yi ghazawāt-i Hindustān*, ed. L.A. Zimin and V.V. Bartol'd, St. Petersburg 1915; Shāraf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī, *Zafar-nāma*, ed. M. 'Abbāsī, Tehran 1957, ed. A. Urubaev, Tashkent 1972.

2. Studies. J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Rapport de Tamerlan avec les chrétiens, in La France en Orient au XV^e siècle*, Paris 1886; M.M. Alexandrescu-Dersca, *La campagne de Timur en Anatolie*, Bucharest 1942; G.A. Fedorov-Davidov, *Iz istorii političeskoj žizni Khorezma xiv v.*, in *Institut Etnografi, Kratkie Soobščeniya*, xxix (1958), 93-9; M.G. Safargaliev, *Raspad Zolotoi Ordī*, Saransk 1960; J. Aubin, *Comment Tamerlan prenait les villes*, in *St. Isl.*, xix (1963), 83-122; B. Finster, *Sistan zur Zeit timuridischer Herrschaft*, in *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*, ix (1976), 207-15; V.V. Bartol'd, art. *Toktamish*, in *EI*; idem, tr. J.M. Rogers, *The burial of Timur*, in *Iran*, xii (1974), 65-87; Aubin, *Le khanat de Čagatai et le Khorasan*, in *Turcica*, viii (1976), 16-60; H.R. Roemer, *Timūr in Iran*, in *Camb. hist. Iran*, vi, 42-97; B.F. Manz, *Tamerlane and the symbolism of sovereignty*, in *Iranian Studies*, xxi/1-2 (1988), 105-22; eadem, *The rise and rule of Tamerlane*, Cambridge 1989; J.E. Woods, *The Tīmūrīd dynasty*, Papers on Central Asia, no. 14, Indiana University, Bloomington 1990; idem, *Timūr's genealogy*, in M.M. Mazzaoui and V.B. Moreen (eds.), *Intellectual studies on Islam, essays written in honor of Martin B. Dickson*, Salt Lake City 1990, 85-126; S. Ando, *Timuridsche Emire nach dem Mu'izz al-ansāb. Untersuchung zur Stammesaristokratie Zentralasiens im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert*, Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 153, Berlin 1992; J. Paul, *Scheiche und Herrscher im Khanat Čagatay*, in *Isl.*, xlvii/2 (1990), 278-321; T. Nagel, *Timur der Eroberer und die islamische Welt des späten Mittelalters*, Munich 1993; N. Nicoloudis, *Byzantine historians on the wars of Timur (Tamerlane) in Central Asia and the Middle East*, in *Jnal. of Oriental and African Studies*, Athens, viii (1996), 83-94; Irfan Habib, *Timur in the political tradition and historiography of Mughal India*, in Maria Szuppe (ed.), *L'héritage timouride. Iran-Asie Centrale-Inde, XV^e-XVIII^e siècles*, Cahiers d'Asie Centrale 3-4, Tashkent-Aix-en-Provence 1997, 297-312; Szuppe, *L'évolution de l'image de Timur et les Timourides dans l'historiographie safavide du XVI^e au XVIII^e siècle*, in *ibid.*, 313-31. (BEATRICE F. MANZ)

TİMÜRIDS, a dynasty of Persia and Central Asia (771-913/1370-1507) founded by the conqueror Tīmūr Lang [q.v.], who rose to power within the Ulus Čaghatay, a tribal confederation covering Transoxania and much of what is now northeastern Afghanistan. This was controlled by Turco-Mongolian military aristocracy, known as "Čaghatay", faithful to Mongol traditions but Muslim and living in close contact with the settled population.

1. History.
2. Literature.
3. Art and architecture.
 - (a) The arts of the book and painting.
 - (b) Architecture.
 - (c) Ceramics.
 - (d) Metalwork.
4. Numismatics.

1. History.

Tīmūr assumed leadership on 12 Ramađān 771/9 April 1370, and spent the first years of rule in campaigns against Kh'ārazm and the eastern Čaghatayid Khānate. In 777-8/1375-7 he installed a Činggisid protégé, Toktamish [see TOKTAMISH] on the throne of the Blue (or White) Horde north of the Syr Darya. Toktamish soon took over the Golden Horde, and began a contest for power with Tīmūr which ended only with Toktamish's defeat on the Kondurcha River near Samara in 793/1391. In 782/1380-1 Tīmūr began campaigning in Persia, whose conquest he completed in 795/1393. In his campaigns to India (800-1/1398-9), Syria (803/1400-1), and Anatolia (804/1402), he achieved suzerainty but installed no administration. In the east, he incorporated Kh'ārazm, the cities just north of the Syr Darya and the Farghānā Valley. He established forts near the Issyk Kul and claimed Kāshghar, but we do not know what level of control he held there. In Persia he created a regular administration, and he attempted to do the same in Arab 'Irāk and Ādharbaydjan, but here his hold remained insecure.

Tīmūr ruled through a Činggisid puppet khān, and acquired Činggisid wives both for himself and for several of his sons, gaining the right to the title of *gūregen* or "royal son-in-law", held by several of his descendants. At the same time, he patronised Islamic institutions and scholars.

Tīmūr left his realm divided into four sections, each under the family of one of his sons, 'Umar Shaykh, Djahāngir, Mīrān Shāh and Shāh Rukh. His death on the eve of 17 Sha'bān 807/18 February 1405 unleashed a struggle for supreme power and struggles for supremacy within each of his sons' regions. Kh'ārazm reverted to the Golden Horde, and Ādharbaydjan fell to the Turkmen Kara Koyunlu in 810/1408. The victor in this succession struggle was Tīmūr's fourth son Shāh Rukh [q.v.], governor of Khurāsān. Shāh Rukh took Transoxania from his nephew Khalīf Sulṭān b. Mīrān Shāh and installed his own son Ulugh Beg [q.v.] as governor in Samarkand on 27 Dhu 'l-Hijja 811/13 May 1409. In 815/1413 he re-took Kh'ārazm, and in the course of two expeditions in 817/1414 and 818/1415 asserted control over Fārs and installed his son Ibrāhīm Sulṭān as governor. Kirmān, Sīstān and Khuzistān also had to be regained through force. In Dhu 'l-Kāda 823/November 1420 Shāh Rukh wrested Ādharbaydjan from the Kara Koyunlu, but for him, as for Tīmūr, it proved easier to conquer than to hold. He had to mount two more expeditions, in 832/1429 and 838/1435, and contented himself with the installation of Kara Koyunlu vassals of his own choosing.

For some time, Shāh Rukh held Tīmūr's domain and maintained formal suzerainty over the Ottomans and the sultans of Dihlī, Bengal and Mālwa in India. At first, he and Ulugh Beg pursued an aggressive policy against the eastern Čaghatayids and Djočids, welcoming in his lands rival khāns, but after a defeat on the Syr Darya in 830/1427, Ulugh Beg ceased to campaign, and the balance of power changed. The