

Ed. VIII

Idg. Forsch., xvi, 326; J. Saint-Martin, *Mémoires historiques et géographiques sur l'Arménie*, i, Paris 1818, 102). In Islamic times the name Tarūn (as spelled by Yākūt, iv, 534) is sometimes used for the town itself, as in al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1408 (cf. J. Markwart, *Süd-Armenien und die Tigrisquellen*, Vienna 1930, 354). The tradition of the Armenian historians connects the foundation of Mūsh with Mushef Mamikonean, the ancestor of the powerful, originally non-Armenian family of the Mamikoneans, who lived in the 4th century A.D. To him is ascribed the construction of a castle, the ruins of which are still visible on one of the hills that dominate Mūsh. This town itself is situated at the mouth of a mountain gorge, and before it extends, as far as the river, a large fertile plain, the "plain of Mūsh". During the first centuries after the Islamic conquest [see ARMĪNIYA, II, 2], Mūsh remained a centre of Armenian national life; from 825-51 it was the residence of the Bagratid Bagrat. After the abduction of this prince to Baghdād in 851, the inhabitants revolted and killed the Muslim governor Yūsuf b. Abī Sa'īd al-Marwānī (al-Ṭabarī, iii, 1408-9). Later on, it was part of the vassal kingdom of the Bagratids. Occasionally, it was occupied by Muslim adventurers, as in the days of Sayf al-Dawla (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 408) in 353/964. About this time, the name Mūsh appears for the first time in Islamic geographical literature (al-Muḥaddasī, 150). In Saldjūk times, the influence of Islam became stronger; the atabegs of the Armanshāh dynasty disputed the territory of Khilāt and Mūsh with the Artukids and even the Ayyūbid Nadjīm al-Dīn laid siege to Mūsh in 604/1207 (Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 169, 180), and in 625/1228 Djalāl al-Dīn Khwārazmshāh was master of the country; in that year, a battle was fought by him and lost on the plain of Mūsh against the Saldjūk ruler of Erzurūm (Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 314; Djuwaynī, *Ta'rikh-i Djihān-gushā*, ii, 181). This accounts for the ruined state of the town in the middle of the 8th/14th century (Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī). After the Mongol period, Mūsh was raided by Timūr in 788/1386, when he invaded the possessions of the Kara Koyunlu (Sharaf al-Dīn, ii, 419). In 878/1473 the power of the Aq Koyunlu ruler Uzun Ḥasan was definitely broken in Armenia, and from that time on Mūsh belonged to the Ottoman Empire. At that time, the population of its surroundings was already strongly mixed with Kurds and Turcomans. The direct authority was exercised by Kurdish local chieftains, who, in the ruling system of the Empire, were subordinated, as *sandjak* begs, either to the *pasha* of Bitlis or to that of Van. At the beginning of the 19th century, there ruled the Kurdish *mīrmīrān* Emīn Pasha, who was deposed in 1828-9 (Ritter, x, 676, and Mehmed Thüreyyā, *Sidjill-i ʿothmānī*, i, 426).

In the administrative changes introduced in the Ottoman empire after the Treaty of Berlin (1878), Mūsh town became the centre of a *sandjak* of that name in the new *wilāyet* of Bitlis carved out of the formerly very extensive *wilāyet* of Erzurum. At this time, Mūsh, with some 5,000 inhabitants, was half-Armenian Christian and half-Kurdish Muslim. There were bishops of the Armenian Gregorian and Catholic Churches and a Protestant community with schools directed by the American Mission. According to its inscription, one of the Armenian churches had been converted into a mosque in 979/1571 (Ritter). The surrounding countryside also had a mixed Muslim-Christian population, in which ancient Christian sanctuaries had long continued to exist, such as the monastery of Surb Karapet, called by the Turks Čañlī Kilise and described by Ewliyā Čelebi.

Towards the end of the century, revolutionary

activity in the Mūsh region was begun by the Armenian nationalist Dashnak guerillas, starting ca. 1894. In the subsequent years, till 1904, bands under the Armenian leader Andranik were active, bringing savage reprisals from the Turkish authorities, culminating in the 1915 massacres in the Mūsh, Bitlis and Sasun districts by Turkish troops and Kurdish irregulars. In the summer of 1916, the Imperial Russian Army overran northeastern Anatolia, including Mūsh, but this last was recaptured in 1917 by Muṣṭafā Kemāl's [see ATATÜRK] Turkish Second Army, and Russian troops withdrew from the whole area in accordance with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (March 1918). With the establishment of the ephemeral Armenian Republic in Transcaucasia 1918-20, Mūsh and Bitlis came theoretically within the boundaries as laid down, when the infant state was in fact already succumbing to Turkish and Bolshevik pressure, by the Treaty of Sèvres (1920).

Under the Turkish republic, Muş has become a largely Kurdish town, the chef-lieu of the *il* or province of Muş, with a population of 44,000 in the town and 234,000 in the province (1970 census).

Bibliography: Yākūt, *Muḍjam*, iv, 682; Abu 'l-Fidā', ed. Reinaud, 392-3; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, 106; Ḥādjdjī Khalīfa, *Djihān-numā*, ed. Constantinople, 416; Ewliyā Čelebī, *Seyāhat-nāme*, iii, 228; C. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, x, Berlin 1843, 662 ff., 676 ff.; V. Cuiet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, i, Paris 1891, 551, 575; Murray's *Handbook of Asia Minor, Transcaucasia, Persia, etc.*, London 1895, 242; Sir Mark Sykes, *The Caliphs' last heritage*, London 1915, 406-9; Naval Intelligence Division, *Geographical Handbooks, Turkey*, London 1942-3, ii, 574 and index; C.J. Walker, *Armenia, the survival of a nation*, London 1980, 142-3, 178, 211-12, 243 ff., 315-17; *IA*, art. *Muş* (Besim Darkot).

(J.H. KRAMERS-[C.E. BOSWORTH])

MUSHĀC (A.) is a technical term denoting common and repartitional ownership by the entire village community of all agricultural lands of the village.

1. In the Near East. In villages in the Middle East where *mushāc* prevailed, the peasant community would convene once every year or two to divide the available land by lot to individual peasants. The history of the institution is extremely obscure. In the technical sense mentioned above, the word *mushāc* does not appear in classical Arabic dictionaries, which may suggest that the institution did not exist in classical Islam, despite the fact that it looks ancient. It is often associated with Bedouin concepts of land-ownership, but this association is far from certain. Thus Bedouin customary law of the Beer Sheba region in Mandatory Palestine was specifically said to lack any trace of *mushāc* (see ʿArif al-ʿArif, *Kitāb al-Ḳaḍā' bayn al-badw*, Jerusalem 1933, 236). Nor is the *mushāc* so much as mentioned in the 10th/16th century Ottoman agrarian *kānūns* and land surveys, where pieces of land are registered individually (all references to *mushāc* in Barkan's collection of 16th-century *kānūns* are to the literal sense of the word). Did the registration officials record the situation in a given moment, or was the *mushāc* as yet non-existent? This question must for the present go unanswered. Another important and difficult question is exactly where, geographically, did the *mushāc* institution exist? In the past it was usually held that practically the entire Middle East was governed by it. As research increases, the area of *mushāc* tends to diminish. Thus documents from the Judaeon mountains in the early 20th century indicate that *mushāc* did