



‘AŠĀYER

‘AŠĀYER, tribes. 1. Definitions. 2. Historical background. 3. Population figures. 4. Territorial distribution: (a) Lor and Lak tribes; (b) Kurdish tribes; (c) Turkish tribes; (d) Arab tribes; (e) Baluch and Brahui tribes. 5. Organization. 6. Economy.

1. *Definitions.* In Persian texts the words *‘ašīra*, *qabīla*, *īl*, *tāyefa*, *ūymāq*, *ūlūs*, and especially their plurals *‘ašāyer*, *qabāyel*, *īlāt*, *ṭawāyef*, *ūymāqāt*, *ūlūsāt*, are often used as synonyms with the general meaning of “tribe,” and in Persian dictionaries they are explained as “lineage, clan, family,” or sometimes “community” or “body of troops.” Such explanations are of no help for understanding the actual diversity of tribal groups.

Another word for tribe, found in old geographical works mainly with reference to the so-called Kurds of Fārs, is *romūm*, the plural of *ramm* (cf. *rama* “flock”), or in some texts *zomūm*, from *zamm*. M. Qazvīnī (V, p. 53) considered *zomūm al-akrād* to be a manuscript error for *romūm*, while De Goeje (BGA VI, p. 250; Ebn Ḳordāḍbeh, Fr. tr., BGA VI, p. 33 n. 2) preferred the reading *zomm* on the basis of the Kurdish word *zūma* (tribe), a suggestion followed by Le Strange (*Lands*, p. 266) but questioned by Minorsky (*EI*¹ IIb, p. 1135; see also Markwart, *Ērānšahr*, p. 27; Schwarz, *Iran* I, pp. 135ff.; Spuler, *Iran*, p. 241 n. 16). Yāqūt (II, p. 821) defines *romūm* as camp sites of and districts inhabited by Kurds (*maḥāll al-akrād wa manāzelohom*). Anyway, in the usage of the present tribes of Iran, *ramm* and *zomm* are seldom, if ever, employed (though *rama* remains current); *ūymāq* and *ūlūs* are also obsolete. As will be seen, a large section of a tribe is now usually termed *ṭāyefa* or *tīra*.



There is no agreement, even today, on the precise criteria to define tribes and distinguish them from other groups. The effort to find a definition began long ago. One of the first thinkers to discuss the social characteristics of bedouin was the historian Ebn Kaldūn (732/1332-808/1406). In his analysis, they are “people who make their living by rearing animals . . . and are obliged to move and roam in search of pastures . . . and water” (*Moqaddema*, Pers. tr., I, p. 228). The cement which holds such people together in a tribe is the *‘aşabīya* (communal pride) which springs from shared ancestry (*elteḥām*) and affinity (*şela-ye raḥem*) and finds expression in confederacy (*walā’*) or alliance (*ḥelf*). Consequently these peoples, unlike sedentary peoples, attach more importance to descent than to domicile (*ibid.*, pp. 243-45).

While Ebn Kaldūn’s experience was mainly of the Arab and Berber tribes of North Africa, more or less similar characteristics can be found in other tribes. Among Turkish-speaking groups, the word *il* not only meant tribe but also had connotations of obedience and friendship. Rašīd-al-dīn Fażlallāh (ca. 645/1247—719/1319) wrote in his history (*Jāme’ al-tawārīk*, p. 159) that “they (the Tatar people) were at most times friendly and obedient (*il o moṭī*) and tributary to the kings of Ketāy.” The researches of W. Irons show that among the present Turkmen of Iran the word *il* is applied primarily to a group of tents (*ūba*) whose occupants keep together and live in peace and amity; these groups then form wider confederacies which locally are also named *il* (corresponding to the *walā’* of Ebn Kaldūn). At the same time *il* is used as an adjective to describe relations between tribes, meaning “at peace with” as against *yāḡī* (at war with). Membership of an *ūba* and an *il* generally depends on genealogy. The members of an *il* perceive their community as made up of small and large patrilineal descent groups, the smallest consisting of brothers, i.e., sons of the same father, the next of brothers and nephews, i.e., descendants of the same paternal grandfather, the third of descendants of the same great-grandfather in the male line, and so on back to the common ancestor of the whole *il*. (Irons, 1974, pp. 640-42).

P. C. Salzman’s studies of the Balūč in the Sarḥadd district (south and southeast of Zāhedān), such as the Yār Aḥmadzehī and the Gamšādzehī, confirm the importance of descent-based organization. Apart from halts, these tribes are constantly on the move, either to gather dates from palm groves in the Māşkel lowland or to find pasturage for their sheep in the Sarḥadd highland. Consequently neither territorial groups such as the *bonend*, a collection of mud or mud-brick houses and palm-frond huts occupied during the date harvest, in



the Māškel nor herding groups such as the *halk*, a number of families who own a flock and camp together, could become the basis of stable social organization in this district. The reverse is the case because the spatial distribution of the *bonends* and *halks* depends on family relationships. In matters such as marriage, prayer, house building, seasonal migration, disputes, etc., lineage is thus the main consideration, not “vicinage.” The territorial groups are themselves formed from descent groups, and their bonds of common descent are reinforced by matrilineal and affinal ties (Salzman, 1972, p. 63).

On a higher plane, Balūčī tribes enter into large and small confederacies on the pattern of Ebn Kaldūn’s *walā’* and *ḥelf*. B. Spooner has described a confederacy of five “leading” tribes of Iranian Baluchistan, namely the Barākzī, Mīr Morādzī, Bozorgzāda, Bolīdā’ī, and Šīrānī, to which the Mobārakī also adhered in 1342 Š./1963. It seems that these tribes, together with others, the Rīgī and the Esmā’īlzī (Šabakš), then had a dominant influence throughout Iranian Baluchistan and that the remaining tribes were all in some way attached to them (Spooner, 1964, p. 60). The nature of these attachments has been described in studies carried out by the Persian Gulf and Sea of ‘Omān Research Center (Markaz-e Pažūhešhā-ye Kalīj-e Fārs wa Daryā-ye ‘Omān, 1335 Š./1976) about the relations of Zayn-al-dīnī, Ra’īsī, Dāwūdī, Darzāda, and Nowkarī tribes with the chiefs of Mobārakī tribe.

The foregoing remarks on the Turkmen and Balūčīs can not be simply generalized and taken as typical of all the tribes of Iran. The conceptual definitions which have been mentioned do not provide adequate criteria for distinguishing tribes from other groups. In Part 3 below we shall discuss certain operational definitions which have been used in Iran in various attempts to compute numerical strengths of tribes, and we shall see how the lack of agreement on this subject has caused confusion in the estimates of Iran’s tribal population.

2. *Historical background.* For facts concerning the appearance, and in some cases disappearance, of various tribes in Iran, the reader is referred to A. K. S. Lambton’s article *Īlāt* in *EI*² and to other relevant articles in *EI*^{1,2} (see Bibliography). It must be emphasized that in Iran nomadism, in the sense of seasonal migration (*kūč*), has since remote times been a way of life side by side with village-dwelling and city-dwelling.

According to Ebn Kordādbeh, quoted with some variations by Ebn al-Faḡīh



(given here in parenthesis), there were four Kurdish tribes (*zomūm*) in Fārs, namely the *zomm* of Ḥasan (Ḥosayn) b. Jilūya or the Bāzanjān, that of Ardām (Arjām) b. Jovānāh (K̄vanjāh), that of Qāsem b. Šahrabarāz (Šahrīār) or the Kūrīān, and that of Ḥasan (Ḥosayn) b. Šāleḥ or the Sūrān (Ebn Kordādbeh, p. 47; Ebn al-Faqīh, pp. 203-04). Somewhat different are the lists in Eṣṭakrī and Ebn Ḥawqal (both mid 4th/10th century), namely the *romūm* of Jilūya or the Ramījān, of Šahrīār or the Bazanjān, of Ḥoseyn b. Šāleḥ or the Dīvān, of Aḥmad b. Layṭ or the Lavālejān, and Aḥmad b. Ḥasan or the Kārīān (Eṣṭakrī, pp. 98-99, 113-14; Ebn Ḥawqal, pp. 264-65, tr. Kramers, pp. 261-62). According to Eṣṭakrī, there were also thirty-three nomad tribes of Kurds (*aḥyā’ al-akrād*) in Fārs, who like the Arabs moved to different pastures in winter and summer, and that altogether they had 500,000 tents (Eṣṭakrī, pp. 114-15; Ebn Ḥawqal, pp. 270-71, tr., p. 267; Moqaddasī, p. 446). A hundred years later, however, according to Ebn al-Balkī (ca. 500/1107), the five Kurdish tribes of Fārs no longer existed, all having been annihilated in wars against the Muslims (p. 168). It would appear that during this period they were largely replaced by Šabānkāra Kurdish tribes. The latter also comprised five main groups, named Esmā‘ilīān, Rāmānīān (cf. Rāmāniya in Eṣṭakrī’s list, p. 114), Karzūbīān, Mas‘ūdīān, and Šakānīān.

Outside of Fārs, there are mentions of the presence of Kurds (the word being used in a broader sense than today and including Lor tribes) elsewhere in Iran and particularly in the western mountainous regions. Ya‘qūbī (3rd/9th century) states in his *Boldān* that there were Kurds at Šaymara, Ḥolvān, Kermānšāh, and some of the villages of Isfahan (*Boldān*, pp. 269-70, 275). Mas‘ūdī (*Morūj* III, pp. 253-54, ed. Pellat, II, sec. 1118) refers to Kurdish tribes called Šūhīān (or Šāhīān) at Dīnavar and Hamadān, and Mājordān at Kankavar (Kangāvar), and more tribes in the province of Jebāl; Eṣṭakrī (pp. 87, 274) to Kurds in the vicinity of Takrīt and Samarra and also in the deserts of Khorasan; Ebn Ḥawqal (pp. 215, 228, 336, 370, 443, 446, tr. Kramers, pp. 209, 223, 329, 362, 428-29, 432) to the Haḍbāniya Kurds at Ošnoh (Ošnūya), to the Ḥamīdiya, Lāriya, Haḍbāniya, and other Kurds at Šahrazūr and Sohravard, to Kurds in the Andkūd (q.v.) district of Jūzjān and the Qohestān district of Khorasan, and to Kurds in what is now Lorestān (most parts of which then belonged to Kūzestān but were later attached to districts of Jebāl). Yāqūt (II, p. 575) mentions the Kurds of a small town named Dašt in the mountains between Erbil and Azarbaijan.

The abodes of the Kūč and Balūč and the Jāt peoples are placed by early



Islamic geographers in the province of Kermān. Ebn al-Faḳīh (p. 206) refers to the cities called Qofş and Bolūş, and Mas'ūdī (op. cit., p. 254, ed. Pellat, sec. 1119) writes of the Qofş and Balūş and the Jatt. Eşṭakrī (p. 163-64) and Ebn Ḥawqal (pp. 309-10, tr. Kramers, pp. 303-05) state that there were seven tribes in the mountains of the Qofş and that the Balūč occupied the skirt of the namesake mountains. These reports are repeated in writings of the 7th/13th century (Yāqūt, I, pp. 732-33, IV, p. 147, 150; Abu'l-Fedā, *Taqwīm al-boldān*, Pers. tr., pp. 380-81; Moḥammad b. Naḳīb Bakrān, *Jahān-nāma*, p. 58).

Although the big Turkish immigrations into Iran did not begin until later, the presence of Turks is occasionally mentioned in writings of the early Islamic centuries. Mas'ūdī (ibid.) mentions Ġūz (i.e., Ġozz) and Ḳarloḳ Turks around Beşṭām and Bost in Sīstān, and Eşṭakrī (pp. 245, 253, 281) mentions Ḳalaḳ who lived in the southern districts of Khorasan and the lands between Sīstān and India and “had the build, appearance, and clothes of Turks and all spoke Turkish.” From the accounts of Eşṭakrī (loc. cit.) and Ebn Ḥawqal (pp. 419, 426, 452, tr. Kramers, pp. 407, 413, 437), it would seem that the Ḳalaḳ had long been established in that region. These two writers (Eşṭakrī, p. 214; Ebn Ḥawqal, p. 383, tr. p. 373) also state that in the province of Astarābād (i.e., Gorgān) there was a *rebāṭ* named Dehestān which lay on the frontier with the Ġozz Turks and was frequented by Turks coming from Ḳvārazm. According to Ebn Bakrān (p. 72) the original abode of the Ġozz had been in the district of Tārāb on both banks of the “Jayḥūn of Čāč” (i.e., the Sayḥūn or Syr Darya). Later a large group of them passed through the province of Balk into the district of Ḳotalān (north of the Amu Darya), whence they burst out in the mid 6th/12th century and invaded Khorasan, penetrating ultimately to Kermān. The same author also mentions the Manḡeşlāḳ Turks around the Kūh-e Sīāh near the Ābaskūn (Caspian) Sea and the Yazer Turks around Şahrestāna and Farāva (two outposts of Khorasan on the edge of the desert sands of Ḳvārazm) and a fortress called Ḥeşār-e Ṭāḳ (ibid., pp. 72-73).

The available evidence shows that the great expansion of nomadism in Iran was not a consequence of either the Arab or the Saljuḳ Turkish invasions, but began with the Mongol conquests in the 7th/13th century (Lambton, in *ET*² III, p. 1096). In the subsequent history of Iran, Turkish and Turkman tribes played leading parts. The tribal regimes of the Saljuqs and the Mongols were followed in the 9th/15th century by those of the Timurid and then the Qara Qoyunlū and Āḳ Qoyunlū Turkmen. The Safavid dynasty (907/1501-1135/1722) won and kept power with the aid of an army consisting primarily of Qizilbāş Turkman



tribes (*ūymāqāt*) such as the Šāmlū, Ostāj̄lū, Du’l-qadr, Qaj̄ar, Afšār, Rūmlū, and Tekelū. After the consolidation of the Safavid regime, Shah Ṭahmāsb (r. 930/1524-984/1576) and especially Shah ‘Abbās I (r. 996/1588-1038/1624) took steps to disband the unruly Qizilbāš tribes, but after the regime’s fall certain Qizilbāš tribes decisively influenced the course of events. Nāder-qolī arose from the Ḳorāsānī branch of the Qereklū *tīra* of the Afšār tribe and, after crushing the Ġaljā’ī (Ġalzay) Afghans, founded the Afšār dynasty. After a short period of rule by the Kurdish (or Lor) clan of Zand in the second half of the 12th/18th century, the government of Iran fell into the hands of the another set of Qizilbāš chiefs, those of the Ašāqabāš section of the Qajar tribe.

From a report which was compiled for the Qajar government in 1215/1800 and gives figures of local revenues and military strengths in Iran in 1128/1715 (reproduced by Dānešpazūh in *FIZ* 20, pp. 396-423), it is possible to outline the territorial distribution of the tribes (not counting the Afghans, Balūč, and Lezgians) at the end of the Safavid period. In this document (pp. 406-15) the tribes are divided into two categories, those of Iranian origin and those “from outside,” i.e., of immigrant origin but domiciled in Iran.

The first category comprises two main and some other groups. One main group is the Lor, made up of four tribes: the Feylī near Ḳorramābād, whose sections migrated seasonally to within three days march from Baghdad; the Lak and Zand, whose winter quarters were in the mountains of ‘Erāq (-e ‘Aĵam) up to the domain of ‘Alī Šokr; the Bakṭiārī, who lived in ‘Erāq (-e ‘Aĵam) between Kūh-e Gilū (= Kūhgīlūya), Behbahān, and Šūštar; and the Mamaysanī (= Mamasanī), who lived in Fārs. The other main group in this category consists of the Kurdish tribes: the Garrūs; the Kalhor; the Mokrī, whose abode stretched from Hamadān to the border of the Marāġa district; and the Za’farānlū, Sa’dānlū, Kavānlū, and Davānlū Kurds in the north of Khorasan. The remaining groups said in the document to be of Iranian origin are the Jalāyer around Marv-e Šāhīān, the Qarā’ī between Torbat (-e Ḥaydarīya) and (Torbat-e) Jām, the Langar, and the Jolā’ī. (In the other sources the Jalāyer and the Qarā’ī are counted as Turks).

In the category of tribes “from outside,” the first group named is that of the Turkish tribes: the Afšār, including the Šāmlū, Qereklū, and Sarvānlū, around Ṭūs in Khorasan and Orūmī (Urmia) in Azarbaijan and in several other parts of Iran (although the Bayāt-e Donbolī are stated in the document to have belonged to the Afšār tribe, they later broke away and made themselves the masters of Ḳoy and Salmās, later Šāhpūr); the Šaqāqī with summer and winter



quarters in Azarbaijan and Gilān (in other sources the Šaqāqī and Donboli tribes are described as Kurds); the Qajar around Astarābād in Gorgān, Īravān (Erivan) in Azarbaijan, and Marv-e Šāhīān in Korasan (in the document the Zangana tribe, which is Kurdish, in Kermānšāh province and the Qaragūzlū tribe in Hamadān province are counted as Qajar) and the Šāhsīvan (= Šāhsevan) living partly in Fārs and partly in Azarbaijan and Gilān. The Qašqaī (= Qašqāī) tribe in Fārs is also mentioned in the document.

The other group of tribes “from outside” is that of the Arab tribes: the Ča‘ab (Ka‘b) at Dawraq (the later Fallāḥīya and the present-day Šādagān); the Mawlāī at Hawīza; the Arab tribe in Fārs; and the Mišmast Arabs in the Toršīz and Qā‘enāt districts, the Zangūī Arabs in the Ṭabas district, and the ‘Omarī Arabs, all in Khorasan (pp. 406-15). This document shows that the geographical distribution of the tribes of Iran had very nearly acquired its final shape before the end of the Safavid period.

3. *Population figures.* Figures of the tribal population of Iran betray obvious confusion. R. F. Thomson (“La Perse,” pp. 17-18), on the basis of J. Sheil’s *Notes on Persian Eelyats*, reckoned the tribal population in the mid 13th/19th century to be about 1,700,000 or approximately 39 percent of the total population of Iran, and Lady Sheil took it to be about one half. Most other writers, however, think that it was not then more than one third. In the later decades of the century, the proportion was generally put at not more than one quarter, as shown in [Table 22](#); estimates by European writers.

In the 20th century, statistics of the urban and rural population have been greatly improved, but knowledge of the size of the tribal population has remained vague. One reason has been the difficulty of taking censuses of persons with no fixed abode, but the main cause has been the use of different definitions for computing tribal numbers. Sometimes tribes have been implicitly identified with ethnic groups; for example, Zolotarev assumed that all the non-Persian-speaking groups were tribal. At other times the implicitly or explicitly used criterion has been attachment to a tribal organization. A more refined use of this criterion was advocated by the late Iranian anthropologist N. Afšār Nāderī (Afshar-Naderi). To determine whether a community is tribal, he considered it necessary and sufficient to ascertain the existence of (1) a tribal organization, i.e., an *īl* (confederacy) divided into *ṭāyefas* (tribes or sections), *tīras* (clans or subsections), and *awlādiyāt* (lineages), and (2) a common territory. On this definition, all persons conscious of relationship to a lineage, clan, tribe, and confederacy belong to the tribal



population (Afshar-Naderi, pp. 4-5).

If the above definition is accepted, groups which are now sedentary but have preserved a tribal organization ought to be counted as tribal. However, such a broad definition has not been generally accepted since many consider only nomadic and potentially nomadic groups as tribal. In the Iranian national census of 1355 Š./1976, the definition was even narrower, being restricted to nomadic groups which were on the move or encamped in tents at the time of the count (generally in Ābān/October-November). (Markaz-e Āmār-e Īrān, 1355 Š./1976, p. 11). The instructions stated that “tribes-people who have become sedentary, or if not sedentarized, are at the time of the census living in ordinary dwelling-units or for the time being in shacks and reed or palm frond huts in their summer or winter quarters, will be counted as part of the normally resident families” (op. cit., p. 77).

In the agricultural census of 1353 Š./1974, the only families counted as tribal were those “not possessing permanent domiciles and dwellings constructed of hard materials . . . but living in black tents” (Markaz-e Āmār-e Īrān, 1353 Š./1974, p. 1). Since most tribes, even if wholly nomadic, live in houses built of unbaked bricks or mud and straw in their winter and summer quarters, the narrowness of these two definitions, particularly the last one, and the discrepancy between them and previously used definitions are self evident.

With so much conceptual disagreement over and above the inherent difficulty of counting families on the move, it is not surprising that the estimates which have been made differ very considerably. In [Table 23](#), estimates from the period 1335 Š./1956-1355 Š./1976 are classified according to the criteria which were used in their compilation. By this means the discrepancies in the figures are to some extent explained.

As regards the figures of 1974 in [Table 23](#), three points require explanation. (1) The figure of 297,000 in the last column is not fully comparable with the other figures in the same column because it excludes tribes-people who were actually on the move but owned houses made of mud or unbaked bricks in their winter or summer quarters. (2) The figure of 877,000 is an estimate by the present writer based on the census figure of non-sedentary (as officially defined) and semi-sedentary families, namely 166,645 families, multiplied by the average family size, namely 5.26 persons. (3) The distinction between “tribal” and “mobile” in the last column refers to membership and non-membership of an organized tribe.



All in all, the figures in Table 23 show that, even if the broadest definition is followed, the proportion of the tribal population to the total population has significantly declined, if only because of the more rapid increase of the urban and sedentary village-dwelling population. From about 25 percent at the start of the 20th century, the proportion fell to 14 percent at the most in 1976. If the definition “nomadic or potentially nomadic” is accepted as the soundest criterion of tribalism in modern conditions and the figures under that heading are used, the proportion fell to only 7 percent in 1976. On the subject of the ethnic composition of the tribes of Iran, the available information is also scarce and more or less unreal. From the report of Mīrzā Moḥammad-Ḥosayn Mostawfī (Dānešpažūh, op-cit., pp. 396-421), it can be inferred that in the early 12th/18th century the proportions of the ethnic groups in the total tribal population excluding the Balūč and the Brāhūīs were 54 percent Lor and Lak, 33 percent Kurdish, 11 percent Turkish, 9 percent Arab, and 2 percent Jalāyer, Qarāī, and Jolāī. Figures from the late 19th century are summarized in [Table 24](#). The consistency of the figures, apart from those of Zolotarev, is not surprising because the remaining four authors were influenced by each other’s estimates.

For the period 1956-76 no reliable estimates are available. The published lists of the tribes are in general so defective that it would be misleading to use them as evidence of ethnic distribution. For example, the list in the encyclopedic volume *Īrānšahr* (Tehran, 1342 Š./ 1963, pp. 116-26) provides no data on the number of families in Turkman tribes, the Arabs of Kūzestān, and the Balūč of Sīstān and Baluchistan. The figures given by C. S. Coon (*ET*² III, p. 8, table II) seem very unbalanced; his estimate of 1,200,000 for the population of the Arab tribes of Iran is far removed from later estimates of a maximum of 200,000. A list published in 1360 Š./1981 by the Markaz-e ‘Ašāyerī-e Īrān is also open to question.

4. *Territorial distribution.* As already noted, we do not yet possess a comprehensive and accurate list of the tribes of Iran and their locations. In the present state of knowledge and in the absence of agreement on uniform definitions, compilation of such a list would hardly seem practicable. For example, it can often be seen that one writer treats a *ṭāyefa* forming part of an *īl* as an independent tribe, and that another writer treats the same unit as a *tīra* forming part of a *ṭāyefa*. The available lists are therefore not mutually comparable. Moreover the tribes themselves constantly evolve. The name, composition, abode, means of livelihood, and even language of a tribe can



change. Nevertheless, a good deal of information about the territorial distribution of the main tribes of Iran can be obtained from the published sources, particularly Kayhān’s *Joğrāfiā* II, Razmārā’s *Joğrāfiā-ye neẓāmī-e Īrān, Īrānšahr*, the reports of the Plan and Budget Organization (*Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja*), 1355 Š./1976, the Tribal Affairs Center (Markaz-e ‘Ašāyerī), and P. Hand’s *Survey of the Tribes of Iran*.

In the present article, the ethnic categorization of the tribes is generally based on present conditions rather than historical origins, because many tribes which are today regarded as Kurdish or Turkish were in past times described as Lor or Lak, and vice versa. For example, the Torkāšvand of Hamadān are of Lor origin, but after moving to their present abode and coming into contact with Kurdish neighbors, such as the Jomūr, they gradually adopted the Kurdish language (Borqā’ī, *Čador-nešīnān*, p. 3); they have therefore been placed in the category of Kurdish tribes. Although there are linguistic and ethnographic grounds for belief that the Gūrān in the provinces of Bāktarān (formerly Kermānšāhān) are not of Kurdish origin (Minorsky, “The Gurān,” pp. 75-103), they are today counted as Kurds. Likewise the Āqā Jārī, now counted as one of the Lor tribes of the province of Kūhgīlūya and Boir Aḥmad, were originally Turks; according to K̄vāja Rašīd-al-dīn Faẓlallāh, a section of the Ġozz (Oğūz) Turks who camped in scrub lands were called Āgāč-Īrī, i.e., scrub-dwellers (*Jāme’ al-tawārīk*, I, p. 108). In Sīstān there is a small tribe known as the Kurds, of well attested Kurdish origin, that is now so assimilated to the Balūčī culture that they have to be classed as a Balūčī tribe. Many more instances could be cited.

(a) Lor and Lak tribes. The Lor tribes live mainly in the mountains of southwestern Iran, but a few small groups are found in Khorasan and in the Sīrjān and Rūdbār districts of Kermān province.

Information about the Lori-speaking Mamasanī (Mām Ḥasanī or Moḥammad Ḥosaynī) in Fārs is scarce, but it is known that a Mamasanī confederacy seized Šūlestān district early in the 12th/18th century and thereby established another Lor domain, hence forth known as Mamasanī, between Kūhgīlūya and Shiraz. The *šahrestān* of that name, lying north of Kāzerūn and west of Ardakān and having its center at Nūrābād, is today occupied by the four main Mamasanī *tāyefas*, namely the Takeš, Jāvīd (or Jāvī), Došmanziārī, and Rostam. They are now almost entirely sedentarized.

North and west of the district lies the abode of other Lor tribes collectively



known as the tribes of Kūhgīlūya and Boir Aḥmadī. Formerly part of Fārs, the territory became a separate *ostān* (province) in 1355 Š./1976. According to reports written in the 1960s, the inhabitants were then divided into three tribal groups, the Jākī, Bāvī, and Āqā Jarī. The Jākīs were originally divided into two moieties, one called Čahār Bonīča comprising the Boir Aḥmadī, Čerāmī, Došmanziārī, and Nū'ī; the other called Līrāvī comprising the Līrāvīs of the mountain and the Līrāvīs of the plain. The Līrāvīs of the mountain were made up of tribes called Bahme'ī, Ṭayyebī, Šīr 'Alī, and Yūsofī. The Bāvīs were centered on Bāšt and Kūhmarra, and despite an opinion that they are an offshoot of the Bāvī Arabs of Kūzestān, they all speak the Lorī language. The Āqā Jarī originated in a confederacy of Turks, Tājīks, and Lors, as shown by the names of their constituent *tīras*, Afšār, Bigdelī, Jāma-Bozorgī, Jağatā'ī, and others; some of them are definitely remnants of the Šāhsevans who governed Kūhgīlūya in the Šafavīd period. (Bāvar, 1324 Š./1945; Zarrābī, 1340 Š./1961; Lom'a, 1346 Š./1967; Afšār Nāderī, 1347 Š./1968; Šafīnežād, 1347 Š./1968). The tribal formations still existing in the province in the early 1980s were named as the Boir Aḥmad, Čerām, Bābū'ī, Došmanziārī, Ṭayyebī, and Bahme'ī.

The Baḳtīārī or Great Lor tribes are one of Iran's most important seasonally migrant communities. Their territory lies in the central Zagros north and west of the Kūhgīlūya territory. They are divided into two component parts (*bolūk*), the Haft Lang and the Čahār Lang. The first official appointment of a Baḳtīārī il-khan took place in 1284/1867 by the order of Moḥammad Shah Qājār. This office and that of the *ilbegī*, which ranked second in the tribal hierarchy, were abolished in Rezā Shah's reign. The Haft Lang tribes migrate annually between southeastern districts of Kūzestān (Andīkā, Masjed-e Solaymān, Šūštar, Īda) and the district of Čahār Maḥāl(l)-e Baḳtīārī (Šahr-e Kord, Borūjen). They are divided into four tribes (*bāb*), the Dūrakī, Bābādī, Baḳtīārvand (or Behdārvand), and Dīnārānī. The Jānakī (or Javānakī) *tīra*, also affiliated to the Haft Lang, is now sedentarized in the district of the same name in Kūzestān. The Čahār Lang tribes have, for the most part, winter quarters in the *šahrestāns* of Dezfūl and Īda in Kūzestān and summer quarters in the *šahrestāns* of Darān (Farīdan) in Isfahan and Alīgūdarz and Borūjerd in Lorestān. They consist of four tribes (*bāb*), the Mamīvand, Moḥammad Šāleḥ (or Mam-Šāleḥ), Mūgūyī, and Kayānertī. The Zalaqī tribes are sometimes counted as part of the Čahār Lang. Many *tīras* of the Čahār Lang tribes have become sedentary. (Owžan Baḳtīārī, 1344 Š./1965; Wezārat-e Ābādānī wa Maskan, 1348 Š./1969; Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja, 1355 Š./1976, pp. 9-57; De Bode, 1845; Rawlinson, 1839, pp. 26-116; Wilson, 1925, pp. 205-25; Garthwaite,



1969; Garthwaite, 1978, pp. 173-97; Digard, 1979).

The Little Lor tribes live in the *ostāns* of Lorestān and Īlām (a separate *ostān* since 1353 Š./1974), i.e., the region between the Dez river in the south and east, the Iraqi frontier in the west, and the *ostān* of Bāktarān (formerly Kermānšāhān) in the northwest and west. Many of these tribes are now sedentary, but some still migrate seasonally in search of pasture between the lowlands north and west of Andīmešk and the highlands in the north and west of the region. As a result of the compulsory sedentarization policy of the years 1313 Š./1934-1320 Š./1941, these Lor tribes were to some extent fragmented. Parts of a single tribe can now be found living in different districts.

The territory of the Bālā Gerīva tribe covers the *baḳš* (district) of Malāvī southwest of Ḳorramābād and lies between the Kūh-e Haštād Pahlū to the north, the Ḳorramābād-Dezfūl highway to the west, and the Dez river to east and south. The two districts of the Weysiān, around Kargāh in the north and the Alvār-e Garmsīrī in the south of Malāvī, can perhaps be appropriately classified as belonging to the Bālā Gerīva. Settled in this territory is the principal remnant of the Dīrakvand tribe, which was formerly made up of four *ṭāyefas* called Bahārvand, Qalāvand, Mīr, and Zaynīvand. Various remnants of the Mīr, now mostly sedentarized, are to be found in Şeymara, Kargāh-e Bālā Gerīva (Malāvī), and the Alvār-e Garmsīrī area. A section of the Bahārvand *ṭāyefa*, which is said to have originally comprised two *tīras* called Morād ‘Alīvand and Ḳord ‘Alīvand, still roams between the Alvār-e Garmsīrī area and Ḳorramābād; but several *tīras* and offshoots, such as the Ḳord ‘Alīvand, Rašnū, Šālvand, and Naǰāfvand, have become independent units and settled around the Āb-e Čūlhūl. The Zaynīvand *ṭāyefa* has been sedentarized at Şaymara near Darraşahr. Two *ṭāyefas* of the Jūdakī tribe, namely the Āqā Reżā’ī and the Āqā Mīrzā’ī, have settled around the Āb-e Čūlhūl and Kargāh, and fragments of the Mīr *ṭāyefa* and the Qalāvand *ṭāyefa* in the Dašt-e Lāla (plain of the wild tulips). In past times this plain was part of the territory of the Pāpī (= servant) tribe, and the sedentarized Moḥammad Ja’farī *ṭāyefa* of the tribe still lives there. The Manāsarī section of the Pāpī tribe, comprising the *ṭāyefas* of the Morādī, the Ya’qūbvand, Madhūnī, Mālzīrī, Keşvarī, Līrīā’ī, and others, lives in the east of the *şahrestān* of Ḳorramābād.

The area in the Piş(-e) Kūh zone lying roughly between the Kūh-e Safīd in the south and the summits of the Kūh-e Garī in the north is called the Selsela. It includes the fertile plain of Alaştar. The *ṭāyefas* and *tīras* of the Selsela comprise the Ḥasanvand, Yūsofvand, Kowlīvand, Karam-‘Alī, Falak-al-dīnī, and



some more small *tīras*. Almost all are now sedentary. Their language is Lorī.

The area called Herū consists essentially of the *baḳšes* of Čaḡalvandī and Zāḡa in the east of the *šahrestān* of Ḳorramābād. Čaḡalvandī is the abode of the important Beyrānvand tribe, Zāḡa that of the Bājūlvand tribe which is made up of *ṭāyefas* called Sagvand, Dālvand, and Qā'ed Raḡmat. These two tribes are said to have moved from Fārs to Lorestān long ago.

The area called Ṭarhān lies between the Şeymara and Kaşḡān rivers in the west of the *ostān* of Lorestān and includes the *baḳš* of Kūhdašt in the *šahrestān* of Ḳorramābād. The Lor tribes of Ṭarhān are the Sūrī and the Emrā'ī, and *ṭāyefas* called 'Alīvand, Ḳvošnāmvand, Garma'ī, and Şīrāvand also live there. Besides these, there are some Lak *ṭāyefas* in Ṭarhān, among whom the Garāvand, Ādīnavand, Kūnānī, Āzādbaḡt, and Owlād-e Qobād may be mentioned.

Dolfān (locally called Delfo), is the northern *baḳš* of Lorestān. It is said to derive its name from Abū Dolaf, the Arab chief who made himself the master of northern Lorestān in the 3rd/9th century. A man taken prisoner by the Dolaf tribe and known after his return as Dolafī reputedly had five sons, Īvat, Mūma, Bīżan, Kākā, and Mīr Beg, each of whom founded a *ṭāyefa* bearing his name. To these must be added another *ṭāyefa*, the Čāvārī (or Čāvārī). All live in the *baḳš* of Dolfān and at most times in the *dehestān* (sub-district) of the same name. The language of the Dolfānī tribes is Lakī (see Ḥ. Īzadpanāh, *Āṭār-e bāstānī o tārikī-e Lorestān* II, Tehran, 2535 = 1355 Š./1976, pp. 292-99).

The *baḳš* of Čegenī is occupied by the Ṭūlābī, Čegenī, Sādāt-e Ḥayāt al-Ġaybī, and other *ṭāyefas*.

The Bālāvand, Zardalānī, and Ṭarhānī tribes live close to Ṭarhān but within the *ostān* of Īlām.

(Sākī, 1343 Š./1964; Kelkī et. al., 1343 Š./1964, p. 27; Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja, 1355 Š./1976, II, pp. 1-49; Feilberg, 1952; Black-Michaud, 1974, pp. 210-88).

(b) Kurdish tribes. During the century between ca. 1880 and 1980, most of the Kurdish tribes of Iran became sedentary. They have not however lost their ethnic culture or even their affiliations. The Kurdish populated parts of modern Iran lie mainly in the *ostāns* of Bāḡtarān (formerly Kermānšāhān), Kurdistan, West Azarbaijan, Īlām (Pošt(-e) Kūh), and the north of Khorasan.



There are also relatively small communities of Kurds in Kermān, Fārs, Varāmīn, Tehran, the Rūdbār district of Gilān, and elsewhere, even in Baluchistan.

Bāktarān (Kermānšāhān) is an important area of Kurdish settlement. Here the Jāf confederacy, until its break-up after the first world war, is said to have numbered 40,000 families under a single chief. Many of the dispersed remnants of the former confederacy still live in the province: Among them are the Javānrūdī tribe, consisting mainly of the Rostam Begī *ṭāyefa*, in the *dehestān* of Javānrūd, and the Ṭalāt tribe, consisting of the Qobādī, Walad Begī, and Bābā Jānī *ṭāyefas*. Many of the Qobādīs are now settled in the *dehestān* of Azgala. The Walad Begīs have homes in Ravānsar, in the southwest of Javānrūd, and in the south of Bāyengān, and winter pastures at Sar-e Qaḷ‘a. Most of the Bābā Jānī tribesmen have become sedentary farmers and stockbreeders in the *dehestān* of the same name.

Also counted as Jāf are the Owrāmān (Avromān) tribes, who are divided according to their abodes into the Owrāmān-e Lahūnī in Nowsūd and Pāva in Bāktarān, and the Owrāmān-e Taḳt in Kurdistan. The very small Īnāqī (or Īnākī and Emāmī groups are also remnants of the Jāf confederacy.

The Sanjābī tribe, one of the most important in Bāktarān, apparently came into being in the second quarter of the 19th century as a coalition of groups of immigrants into the area from Fārs, Iraq, and Lorestān (M. K. Mokrī, “Ašāyer-e Kord,” *Yādgar* 5/1-2, p. 85). They used to move between summer quarters in the Māhīdašt plain in the west of Bāktarān and winter quarters in the Zohāb district on the Iraqi frontier, but are now either settled, for the most part in the Māhīdašt, in the *dehestān* of Sanjābī in the *šahrestān* of Eslāmābād (formerly Šāhābād-e Ġarb), or make only short transhumances, though some still move annually to Zohāb where they grow crops and rear livestock. The principal Sanjābī *tīras* are the Dālīān, Čalābī (or Čalāvī), and Korda-Dasteja. Some groups, such as the Pīr ‘Alī and Būlī *tīras*, speak dialects which differ from the main Sanjābī dialect.

The Gūrān tribe is one of the oldest in this region. Its center is the village of Gahvāra in the *dehestān* of Gūrān. The Qalkānī *ṭāyefa* was formerly included in the tribe, but the present *ṭāyefas* of the Gūrān are the Bīvanīž (Bīvanīj), with summer quarters north of Kerend and winter quarters in Zohāb; the Čūpānkāra, now mostly sedentarized around Qaḷ‘a-e Qāzī; the Ḥaydarī, who move between Sīāvāna (north of Kerend) and Tang-e Zohāb; and the Tofangči,



now sedentarized in the north of the *dehestān* of Gūrān. In religion the Gūrān are generally Ahl-e Ḥaqq (q.v.). They are thought to be of non-Kurdish origin. The Qalkānīs, who lived in the *dehestān* of the same name in the north of the *baḵš* of Kerend, are today regarded as a separate tribe.

The majority of the Kalhor, another big Kurdish tribe, live in Bāḵtarān and either are sedentarized or move between summer and winter quarters within the province, though a few migrate annually to the Mehrān-Dehlorān belt in Īlām. The following components of the Kalhor have been mentioned: the Čenār o Kenār *tīra*, the *ṭāyefas* of the Ḥasanābād area 40 km southwest of Šahr-e Bāḵtarān (Kermānšāh), a Kalhor *tīra* in the Māhīdašt, and “foreign” *ṭāyefas* who are not pure Kalhor and probably came from Pošt-e Kuh (Īlām) and Kūzestān, as well as some others.

The tribes of Kerend, a collection of small tribes most of whom broke away from larger tribes, are the Bābā Jānī, Jāf-e Gandombān (an offshoot of the Talāt), Sīmānī-ye Gāsūr, Jowzaga (Ahl-e Ḥaqq, originally Gūrān), Kolāh-pahn (related to the Kalhor), and Ḥabībavand (immigrants from Pošt-e Kūh).

Other tribes of Kurds, Laks, and Lors whose presence in Bāḵtarān is mentioned are the Jalīlvand at Dīnavar, the Jomeyr (or Jomūr), the Torkāšvand, and the Zūla. The last three make annual migrations from Bāḵtarān to Hamadān province and to the Mehrān-Dehlorān belt in Īlām, some going as far as Kūzestān. (Keyvānpūr Mokri, 1326 Š./1947-1327 Š./1948; Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja, 1355 Š./1976, II. pp. 1-81; Borqaī, 1352 Š./1973).

In Īlām (the old Pošt-e Kūh), Kurdish, Lak, and Lor tribes converge and are so intermingled that identification of them as such is not easy (Kayhān, *Jograftā* II, p. 465). The Kurdish tribes of the *ostān* live on the *baḵšes* of Ābdānān and Zarrīnābād and parts of Mehrān, Dehlorān, and Mūsīān; they are the Jāyervand, Mamsīvand, Koll-e Kūh, Qā’ed-e Korda, Dīnārvand, and Dast-‘Alīvand. The principal mixed Kurdish-Lorī tribes are the Arkawāzī, Malekšāhī, Gačī, Šūhān, Kezel, Bījanvand, Hendomīnī, ‘Alīšīrvān, and Mīškāš, and there are some others. In addition, there are tribes which annually migrate to Īlām from Hamadān, Bāḵtarān, and Lorestān, e.g., the Zangana, Zūla, Kalhor, Jomeyr, and Beyrānvand. (Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja, 1355 Š./1976, III, pp. 1-44; Refatī, 1356 Š./1977).

On the tribes of the *ostān* of Kurdistan proper, not much information is available. Most have become fully sedentary or only make short



transhumances. Among the numerous tribes reported to be settled in the *šahrestāns* of Sanandaĵ and Marīvān are the Kūmāsī in the *dehestān* of the same name in the east of Marīvān, the Kalātarzān (or Kalāntarzān) between Kūmāsī and Sanandaĵ, and the Kaškī and Kamāngar *ṭāyefas* in the *baḵš* of Kāmyārān south of Sanandaĵ. The now sedentarized Kohnapūš and Kānī Sāsānī *ṭāyefas* also live in Marīvān. The Solṭānī *ṭāyefa* of the Owrāmān-e Taḵt tribe is settled in Owrāmān in the south of the *šahrestān* of Marīvān. Around Divāndarra in the north of the *šahrestān* of Sanandaĵ, specifically in the *dehestāns* of Qarā Tūra, Ūbātū, and Sārāl, live various *ṭāyefas* of the Galbāgī tribe, such as the Qomrī, Kāmelī, Jūjarašī (Čūḵarašī), Morād Gūrānī, Qalqālī (or Qālqālī), etc. The Hendomī tribe lives at Ḥasanābād, north of Sanandaĵ and south and west of the Galbāgī territory, and is made up of *ṭāyefas* called Moḥammad Morādī, Tārī Morādī, and Āḵa Sūrī.

The tribes and *ṭāyefas* in the *šahrestān* of Saqqez are also numerous and varied: Geverg of Saqqez (related to the Geverg of Sardašt and Mahābād in West Arbaijan), Feyzallāh Begī, Tīla Kūh (or Tīlakū), Kalālī, Kalhor, Ardalān, Wakīlī-e Qabāglū, Dehbokrī of Saqqez, Saršīv of Saqqez, Ḳorḳora, and Gūra of Qal‘a-ye Dīvānī. The Jāf of Saqqez, consisting of the Mīkā‘īlī, Šāṭerī, Tīrḳālī, Esmā‘īl Ġadīrī, and other *ṭāyefas*, are settled in the *dehestāns* of Saršīv of Saqqez, Ḳorḳora, and Tīlakū; they are considered to be offshoots of the Morādī (as opposed to Javānrūdī) tribe of the Jāf. Among the tribes of the *šahrestān* of Bāna, *ṭāyefas* called Aḥmadī, Loṭfallāh Begī, Šahīdī, and Bahrām Begī have been mentioned. (Mardūk, 1351 Š./1972; Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdĵa, 1355 Š./1976, III, pp. 1-32).

The Kurdish tribal zone stretches into West Azarbaijan. The Bīlbās tribe, in three *ṭāyefas*, the Mangūr, Pīrān, and Māmaš, is dispersed over the *šahrestān* of Pīranšahr and part of the *šahrestān* of Mahābād; these groups are in effect sedentary, finding pasturage for their flocks either “vertically” in the mountains or “horizontally” in the plain, but in either case close to their homes. The Mokrī and Dehbokrī tribes live in the *šahrestān* of Mahābād (formerly Sāvoĵ Bolāg) in settlements at Šahr-e Veyrān, Āḳtāčī, Behī, and Gūrek-e Mokrī. The Gūrek tribes occupy the *dehestāns* in the north of the *šahrestān* of Sardašt, and the Melkārī, Ālān, Baryājī, and other *tīras* of the Sūsni tribe live in the south and west of the same *šahrestān*. The Harakī tribe moves between summer and winter quarters in the *dehestāns* of Targavar, Dašt, and Margavar. The well-known Šakkāk tribe is settled in the *baḵšes* of Barādūst and Šūmāy, west of the Lake Urmia on the frontier with Turkey. The



abodes of the Zarzā and the Qara Pāpāq are reported to be around the town of Ošnūya, and that of the Sādāt, around the villages of Dašt and Mangūr. The Mīlān tribe, said by some to be one of the two *tīras* of the Jalālī tribe (the other being called Qizilbāš), is of Kurdish origin but today mainly Turkish-speaking; they are settled near Mākū (Maǰīdzāda, 1342 Š./1963; Šāmlū, 1342 Š./1963, pp. 21-25; Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja, 1355 Š./1976, I, pp. 103-49).

In the Safavid period certain Kurdish tribes were forced to move to the north of Khorasan, and today there are scattered settlements of Kurds descended from them between Saraḵs in the extreme northeast and the frontier post of Čāt in Gorgān. The two principal remaining Kurdish tribes of Khorasan are the Za'farānlū, made up of numerous *ṭāyefas* such as the Kikānlū, Bīčārānlū, Seyfkānlū, 'Ammārlū, etc., and the Šādlū comprising the Dīvānlū, Bārzānlū, and Qara Čūrlū (Čūllū). A considerable number of 'Ammārlū Kurds, whose ancestors were likewise forcibly transported, live in the southeast of the Rūdbār district in the *ostān* of Gīlān (Pūr-Karīm, 1348 Š./1969, pp. 23-30: Tawaḥḥodī, 1359 Š./1980).

(c) Turkish tribes. The Turkish-speaking tribes of Iran are scattered over many regions. Their establishment in the country began with the first incursions of Turkish-speaking peoples and continued in the periods of the Saljuq, Mongol, Timurid, and Safavid rule. For a variety of reasons, rulers of these dynasties shifted tribes to distant parts of Iran: to employ the tribe for guarding a frontier, to fragment it, to punish it, or to reward and encourage it. One conspicuous example is the dispersal of the Afšār tribe, sections of which are to be found in Khorasan, West Azarbaijan, Kūzestān, Fārs, and Kermān.

The principal Turcophone tribe in Fārs is the Qašqā'ī. In the Qajar period, the tribe was administered by its *il-kānī* and his deputy and chief executive, the *il-begī*, and was apparently not yet organized on the basis of *ṭāyefas*. Today the tribe is a union of approximately 200 *tīras* of Turkish, Lorī, Kurdish, and Arab origin, but all speaking the same Gōzz Turkish dialect. There was formerly a large number of *ṭāyefas*, but today they have been incorporated into six main *ṭāyefas*, named Darra-Šūrī, Kaškūlī-e Bozorg, Kaškūlī-e Kūček, Fārsīmadān, 'Amala, and Šešbōlūkī. The Qašqā'ī territory starts at Lār and stretches through the southern parts of Fārs almost to Behbahān. In spring and early summer the different *ṭāyefas* of the tribe traverse distances of between 400 and 500 km to reach their summer quarters. With the exception of a small group whose summer pastures (called the Sarḥadd-e Kūček) lie in the eastern part of the Dašt-e Aržan near Kāzerūn, the Qašqā'ī tribes-people have their main summer



pastures (called the Sarḥadd-e Bozorg) in the area stretching from Eqlīd and Ābāda westward to the Kūh-e Denā and northward to near Šahrežā (Bahman Bigī, 1324 Š./1945; Peymān, 1347 Š./1968; ‘Ajamī, 1352 Š./1973; Oberling, 1974).

Three of the tribes which belonged to the Kamsa confederacy in Fārs, namely the Īnānlū, Bahārlū, and Nafar are Turcophone. Since the last quarter of the 19th century, they have either become fully sedentary in eastern districts of the province or have been absorbed into other tribes.

The Īlsevan (formerly Šāhsevan) tribes in East Azarbaijan are another important Turcophone group, comprising the Gīklū, ‘Īsālū, Qūjā, Hājjī Kōjālū (or Hājjī Kṽāja), Moḡānlū, and others. In Safavid times they belonged to the Qizilbāš. Their present territory lies in the north of the *ostān* between Ardabīl and the Soviet frontier. The Īlsevans (Šāhsevans) around Ardabīl are now wholly sedentarized, but some of the *ṭāyefas* around Meškīnšahr still move annually between the foothills of Mount Sabalān and the Moḡān Plain. Elsewhere, Īlsevan *tīras* named Baḡdādī and Īnālū are settled around Sāva, Qom, and Qazvīn. The Īnānlū of the Kamsa confederacy in Fārs are thought to have originally been an Īlsevan tribe.

Among the other Turcophone tribes of Azarbaijan are those of the *šahrestān* of Arasbārān (Ahar), with winter quarters in the strip along the Aras river near Kōdā-āfarīn and summer quarters in the Arasbārān mountains and the Ahar-Meškīnšahr highland; and those of the *šahrestān* of Marand, with winter quarters along the Marand-Bāzargān highway and spring and summer quarters in the Meškīnšahr district (Bāybūrdī, 1341 Š./1962; Karīmzāda, 1352 Š./1973; Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja, 1355 Š./1976, III, pp. 1-27; Op’t Land, 1961; Schweizer, 1970, pp. 81-148; Tapper, 1971).

The Turkmen of Iran live almost entirely in the *šahrestāns* of Gorgān and Gonbad-e Qābūs in Māzandarān and Bojnūrd in Khorasan as far as Qūčān. Their two big *ṭāyefas*, the Yomūt and the Gūklān, came to Iran long ago. The Yomūt was originally divided into two branches, the Āq Ātābāy, made up of the Āq, the Ātābāy, and the Šarīf, and the Ja’farbāy, made up of the Yār ‘Alī and the Nūr ‘Alī. The position today is that there are three mutually independent *ṭāyefas*, the Ja’farbāy, the Ātābāy, and the Āq Ātābāy. The Ja’farbāy live in the *baḡš* of Gomīšān on the Caspian coast, the Ātābāy in that of Āq Qal’a (formerly Pahlavī Dež), and the Āq Ātābāy around Gonbad-e Qābūs. The Gūklān likewise were originally divided into two big branches, the Bozorgtāy and the Dūdūrḡa, but today they have largely abandoned their former organization. The



territory of Gūklān is a *baḵš* bearing its name, lying north of Gonbad-e Qābūs and stretching as far as Bojnūrd. The majority of the Takka Turkmen live in Soviet Turkmenistan, but a number of them are domiciled in Iran in the *baḵš* of Jargalān in the *šahrestān* of Bojnūrd. The Qarnas, originally belonging to the Gūklān but now independent, are settled in the Golī-Dāgī. The Noḵūrlī Turkmen live in the *dehestān* of the same name in Jargalān (Pūr-Karīm, 1341 Š./1962-1348 Š./1969; Lugashev, 1359 Š./1970; Irons, 1974, pp. 635-37).

In addition to the Turkmen, there are other Turkish tribal groups in Khorasan, but these are now too intermixed with the indigenous local people to be easily distinguished from them. Moreover, some no longer speak Turkish and have adopted Persian. Among these groups which were originally Turkish tribes, the following deserve mention: The Tīmūrī around Torbat-e Jām, the Barbarī at Bālā Jām and Farīmān, the Īlsevan (Šāhsevan) at Baḡbaḡū near Mozdūrān between Mašhad and Saraḵs, and the Qarā'ī around Roštkvār southeast of Torbat-e Ḥaydarīya (Šāh-ālamī, 1308 Š./1929; Ivanov, 1926, pp. 143-58).

In the *ostān* of Kermān there is an offshoot of the Qarā'ī, known as the Qarā'ī of Kermān, with summer quarters around Tangū Pā'in and Kāna Sorḵ in the mountains northeast of Sīrjān and winter quarters south of the town along the Sīrjān-Bandar-e 'Abbās road as far as 'Alīābād and Nāzīābad. The most important Turcophone tribes of Kermān are the Būčāqčī and the Afšār; the former are still nomadic, spending the summer in the Čahār Gonbad district near Sīrjān and the winter in 'Ayn-al-bayar and Čāh Qal'a on the borders of Kermān and Fārs. The Afšār tribes-people of Kermān, who are known as the Afšār-e Tafreḡa and perhaps came to the province after the collapse of the Afsar dynasty in Khorasan, spend the winter in the plain of Ārzūya west and south of Esfandaḡa in the *šahrestān* of Jīroft and the summer around the town of Bāft and the villages of Faṭḡābād, Gūḡar and Ḥoṣūn not far from the summer pastures of the Būčāqčī. Both the Būčāqčīs and the Afšārs speak Turkish with a large admixture of Persian words and are well acquainted with the local dialect of Persian (Wazīrī Kermānī, 1353 Š./1974; Bāstānī Pārīzī, 1355 Š./1976, I; Stober, 1978).

(d) Arab tribes. From remote times, and particularly after the Arab conquest, right up to the Qajar period, Arab tribes immigrated into Iran. With the passage of time most of the early immigrants merged into the local populations, and today their descendants are scarcely distinguishable from their neighbors. Such are the Arab tribes of Khorasan, including the Bohlūlī in the *baḵš* of Kvāf, Baḵūzī in the *baḵš* of Bākarz (Tāyebād), Kāzā'ī at Guša-ye



Ḳazā’ī, Ḳāvarī at Qara Zar, Nādī around Bīrjand and Sarbīša, Abū Baḳš east of Sedeh, and the Arabs living in the *baḳš* of Nehbandān south of Bīrjand in a locality called the ‘Arabkāna.

The Arab tribes of Ḳūzestān, however, have kept their identity better. They are scattered over a zone stretching from the Arvand-rūd (Šaṭṭ al-‘Arab) and Persian Gulf in the south to Šūš in the north and lying roughly to the west of the Baḳtīārī territory. The main tribe in the south of the *ostān* is the Banī Ka’b, comprising the Moḥaysen, Edrīs, Naṣṣār, Āl Boḡobeš ‘Asākera, and various other sections and *ṭāyefas*; they live in dispersed groups on Mīnū (formerly Ḳezr) island near Ābādān, at Ḳorramšahr (the old Moḥammara), in the *baḳš* of Šādḡān (formerly Fallāḡīya), on both banks of the Kārūn up to ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan and Edrīsīya, and further north near Ahvāz. Also settled in the *baḳš* of Šādḡān is the Ḥanāfera tribe. In the *šahrestān* of Ahvāz, the Bāvī tribe is settled in the *baḳš* of Bāvī, which extends from Esmā’īlīa to Ahvāz, Weys, Zargān, and Mūrān. The Āl Kaṭīr tribe (q.v.), comprising the Sa’d, Bayt Karīm, ‘Anāfeja, Žayāḡema, and others, live in the same *šahrestān* west and south of the Dezfūl river up to the Nahr-e Hāšem and also between the Dezfūl river and the Šūštar river. The Montafaj (Montafeq) or Banī Mālek Arabs cultivate lands between Sab’a Omm al-Tamsīr on the left bank of the Kārūn. The Čanāna are settled in the *šahrestān* of Dezfūl, and the Gandazlū in an area east of Šūštar.

The well-known Banī Ṭorof tribe is settled in the Dašt-e Āzādāḡān (formerly Dašt-e Mīšān) around the town of Hūzagān (formerly Hawīza), and consists of seven *ṭāyefas*, the Sovārī, Marza’ā, Šorfa, Banī Šāleḡ, Marvān, Qāṭe’, and Sayyed Ne’mat. North of the lands of the ‘Anāfeja of the Āl Kaṭīr, in the area called Mīānāb, between the Kārūn and Karḡa rivers, dwell several Arab tribes, of which the best known are the Ka’b (probably an offshoot of the Banī Ka’b of southern Ḳūzestān), the ‘Abd-al-Ḳānī, the Mazra’a, the Āl Bū Rāwīya, and the Sādāt. These tribes gradually immigrated into Iran during and after the early years of the Qajar period.

There are also some Arab tribes-people settled in part of the Mūsīān district in the south of Īlām (Qā’em-maḡāmī, 1324 Š./1945 and 1324-25 Š./1945-46; ‘Abd al-Ġaffār Najm-al-molk, 1341 Š./1962).

Outside Ḳūzestān, the Īl-e ‘Arab of the Ḳamsa confederacy is an important tribe; it is divided into two sections, the Šaybānī and the Jabbāra, and numerous *tīras*. They migrate annually from Lorestān in the south of Fārs to the Eqlīd district in the north, where their summer quarters are flanked on the



east by those of the Persian-speaking Bāšerī, another Ƙamsa tribe.

(e) Balūčī and Brāhūī tribes. Most of the Balūčī and Brāhūī tribes of Iran live in the *ostān* of Sīstān and Baluchistan, but Balūčī groups have also settled in other provinces: in Hormozgān (Bandar-e ‘Abbās), in Kermān, mainly in the *baḳš* of Kahnūj in the *šahrestān* of Jīroft, in Khorasan, and in Māzandarān in the Torkman Šaḩrā (the plain between the Gorgān and Atrak rivers). The majority of the members of the Sārānī, Raḳšānī, Bārānī, Jahāndīda, and Malekzehī *ṭāyefas*, who lived mainly in the *baḳš* of Mīānkangī in the *šahrestān* of Zābol, have now emigrated to the Torkman Šaḩrā. The Balūč of Khorasan are in general sedentarized and intermixed with the local people, but some distinct communities still remain, scattered from Saraḳs in the northeast to Bīrjand and Ṭabas in the south. In the last named districts, *tīras* called Nūqānī, Deh Morda, and Brāhūī remain, sometimes living together with other groups such as the Tīmūrīs. Some of the Balūčī *ṭāyefas* of Sīstān, such as the Nārūī and the Brāhūī, migrate annually to the highlands of Nehbandān, and Bīrjand in Khorasan.

In the Qajar period, many parts of Baluchistan were ruled de facto by the chiefs (*sardārs*) of the Nārūī tribe. When the central government began to establish its authority, the *sardārs* moved to the Nīkšahr-Bent-Fannūj area in the southwest of the province and kept control there. The leadership of the tribe was held by three families, first the Šīrḳānzāda, then the Šīrḳānzehī, and finally the Šīrānī who still live in the area. Another section of the Nārūīs is domiciled in Sīstān and in the northwest of the *šahrestān* of Zāhedān, where its *sardārs* have their seat in the *baḳš* of Noṣratābād.

The Rīgī tribe, one of the biggest Balūčī groups in Iran, has an extensive territory stretching from Zāhedān and Mīrjāva to Ƙāš and onward toward Īrānšahr; it is divided into several *tīras*, among which are the Bolākzehī, Šahkaramzehī, and ‘Īsāzehī. Another tribe in the Zāhedān-Ƙāš belt is the Esmāīlzehī (formerly Šahbaḳš), which arose from the union of the Esmāīlzehī and ḩasanzehī *ṭāyefas*; its members are now engaged in stockbreeding in a small area in the Noṣratābād district.

The Yār Aḩmadī (Šahnavāzī) and Gamšādzehī were apparently once *ṭāyefas* of the Dāmanī tribe, but are now more or less independent. Yār Aḩmadī tribespeople, based around Gazv in the Ƙāš district, migrate annually from the west side of the Pošt-e Kūh to Taftān, and then to palm groves in the Māškel lowland for the date harvest. The Gamšādzehīs, whose abode lies to the



southeast around Gošt and Jālq and in the foothills of the Kūh-e Safīd, are made up of the Dādḳodāzehī, Morādzehī, Moḥammadzehī, and several more *tīras*. The Rīgī, Esmā’īlzehī, Yār Aḥmadzehī, and Gamšādzehī rank as the four main tribes of the Sarḥadd (i.e., the northern part of Iranian Baluchistan).

Further south, in the *šahrestān* of Sarāvān, lies an area occupied by the large Dohānī tribe centered at Mūltān; they likewise migrate annually for the date harvest.

The Bārakzehī (also called Bārānehī) tribe in the *šahrestān* of Īrānšahr, and the Bolīda’ī tribe in the *baḳšes* of Rāsk in Īrānšahr and Daštyārī and Qaṣr-e Qand in the *šahrestān* of Čāhbahār, have now become sedentary. The last named tribe has the leadership (*sīadat*) of sections of the Ra’īsī and Rend tribes-people. In addition to these, the area is the home of the Darzādagān, who were described in 1307/1928 and later as the Darzāda *golāms* (i.e. servants) and are evidently the survivors of an old system of slavery, and of the Zayn-al-dīnīs, who are dependents of the Mobārakī *sardārs*. Scattered over the *baḳš* of Daštyārī down to the coast are some more or less independent *ṭāyefas* of the Sardārzehī tribe, namely the Jadgāl, Jat, Latīk, Kūsa, Mīr, Sītār, Šāberū, and Lagūr. The Hūt tribes-people are settled around Konārak. The Ra’īsī *ṭāyefa* is an important one, living at Sarbāz, Čānf, and Pīp in the east of the *baḳšes* of Nīkšahr and Qaṣr-e Qand. In past times the Ra’īsīs had a firm alliance with the Mobārakīs, who reside at Čānf, but this has lapsed.

The Lāšār *ṭāyefa* is settled in the *dehestān* of the same name in the *baḳš* of Bampūr, and the Bāmerī *ṭāyefa* occupies the western part of the *baḳš* of Bampūr up to the Jāz Mūrīān swamp.

Balūčī and Brāhū’ī *ṭāyefas* are also to be found in Sīstān (the *šahrestān* of Zābol), e.g., the Brāhū’ī, Nārū’ī, Bārānī, Mīr, and Sārānī. The Kurds of Sīstān must also be counted among them.

As regards the Brāhū’īs, the almost unanimous opinion is that they are not Balūč. According to one report they are a *tīra* of the Mamasanī tribe of Fārs. Another view is that they stem from the Kūč (or Kurd) people mentioned together with the Balūč by early Islamic geographers. In any case, the tribes of today are too intermingled to be easily identifiable as Brāhū’ī or Balūčī. Many pastoral Brāhū’ī *tīras*, such as the Zīrkārī, Naḳa’ī, Mālekī, and Čandal, take their flocks annually to the Qā’enāt district in Khorasan.



In all probability the Balūč were driven from Kermān into Balūčestān after the penetration of the Saljuq forces into Kermān. Balūči tribes, however, are to be found in Kermān province today: amongst others, the Sarābandī in the *šahrestān* of Bam, and a section of the Hūt at Kohan ‘Alī in the southeast of the *baḵš* of Kahnūj, near the Jāz Mūrīān.

In the *ostān* of Hormozgān, the Ṭāherzehī *ṭāyefa* is settled in the area stretching from the port of Jāsk to near Mīnāb and into the Bašāgerd mountains. A section of the Anūšīrvānī *ṭāyefa*, whose original home was in Sarāvān, also now lives in the *šahrestān* of Mīnāb between Jāsk and Sīrīk.

The Mid tribe is to be found all along the coast from Gavāter in the east of Sīrīk in the west (Markaz-e Pažūheš-e Ḳalīj-e Fārs wa Daryā-ye ‘Omān, 1354 Š./1975 and 1355 Š./1976; Spooner, 1964, pp. 53-57; Spooner, 1967; Salzman, 1972, pp. 60-68).

5. *Organization*. As far as the tribes of Iran are concerned, tribal organization is a system designed to integrate the nuclear families into the tribal community, to enable them to perform functions for which they are responsible, and also to secure the tribe’s unity. Ethnic identity alone (e.g., being Lak, Lor, or Kurdish) is not a sufficient basis for lasting unity. Many of the tribal confederacies in Iran are in fact made up of ethnically different *ṭāyefas* and *tīras*, and conversely no tribal confederacy includes the whole of an ethnic group. In general, tribal organization at the lower level is based on kinship and at the higher levels on administrative and political alliance. In many tribes the structure is of a more or less uniform type which has been described as “segmentary lineage organization;” but there are also variations from one tribe to another depending on factors such as the degree of the tribe’s integration or dispersion, the source and nature of its economic activity, etc. Some examples are given below.

The Turcophone Qašqā’ī confederacy (*īl*) came into being as an alliance of Turkish, Ḳalaĵ, and also Lor, Kurdish, and Lak *tīras*. The names of twenty two Qašqā’ī *tīras* in the late 13th/19th century are given by the historian Fasā’ī, and some of these names, such as Balīlavand, Feylī, and Jāma-Bozorgī, show that the particular *tīras* were Lor and Lak (Fasā’ī, p. 313). It seems that, as the number and the populations of the *tīras* grew, the *īlḳānī* appointed certain khans who were each to direct the affairs of a group of *tīras*, thereafter named a *ṭāyefa* (Peymān, 1342 Š./1963, p. 220). From the printed data (if trustworthy) it can be seen that with the passage of time the number of the *ṭāyefas* fell while



the number of the *tīras* rose. The number of the *ṭāyefas* in the Qaşqā’ī confederacy in the period 1313 Š./1934-1320 Š./1941 was reported as 27 (ibid., p. 225), and the number in 1341-42 Š./1962-63 as 9, two of which, the Şafī Kānī and the Raḥīmī, had practically been absorbed into others (ibid., p. 232). In later publications, only six *ṭāyefas* are mentioned: the Darra-Şūrī, Şeş-Bolūkī, ‘Amala, Fārsīmadān, Kaşkūlī-e Bozorg, and Kaşkūlī-e Kūçek. The Qarāča’ī *ṭāyefa* is sometimes said to belong to the Qaşqā’ī and sometimes to be independent (Āyatallāhī, 1357 Š./1978, p. 9). The number of the *tīras* in the Qaşqā’ī confederacy in 1311 Š./1932 was reported as 90 (Kayhān, pp. 79-85), and the number in 1340 Š./1961 and subsequent years as between 180 and 200. Clearly a process of change has resulted in multiplication of the *tīras* within each *ṭāyefa*. For example, the number of the *tīras* in the Fārsīmadān *ṭāyefa* rose from 12 in 1313 Š./1934-1320 Š./1941 to 20 in 1341 Š./1962-63 (Peymān, 1342 Š./1963, p. 234), and reached 21 in 1352 Š./1973 (‘Ajamī, 1352 Š./1973, p. 2) and 1353 Š./1974 (Āyatallāhī, 1357 Š./1978, p. 9). In 1352 Š./1973 the Fārsīmadān *ṭāyefa* comprised 2080 families, and the ‘Amala, described as a *tīra* of it, comprised 79 families or 400 persons.

Despite the frequency of kinship between families within a *tīra* (due mainly to preference for endogamy), a *tīra* is not necessarily a kin-based unit. Together with ethnic and genealogical considerations, historical and political reasons for cohesion have been essential factors in the genesis of *tīras*. That is why many *tīras* took the name of the founder, e.g., the Ḥasan Āqā’ī *tīra* of the Kaşkūlī-e Bozorg. This practice is by no means general, however, because in addition to ancestry, names of *tīras* refer to geographical provenance (e.g., the Mūşūlū or Mawşel-lū of the ‘Amala and Fārsīmadān), to land owned by the *tīra* (e.g.; the Kezenlū of the Darra-Şūrī *ṭāyefa* from their property at Kezen), to ethnic origin (e.g., the Lak and Qara Qovānlū or Qara Qoyunlū of the Darra-Şūrī), to occupation (e.g., the Āhangar, i.e., smith, *tīra* of the Şeş-Bolūkī, and the Salmānī, i.e., barber, Darzī, i.e., tailor, and ‘Āşeḡ, i.e., minstrel, *tīras* of the Darra-Şūrī), and the like (Peymān, 1342 Š./1963, p. 203).

In the Qaşqā’ī confederacy, the *tīras* are divided into smaller units called *bonkū*. A *bonkū* is a group of families who make the seasonal migrations together and jointly use particular grazing grounds; in fact it is a sort of cooperative society analogous to the *bona* in a village community. Other names for this type of group are *ūba*, *būlūk*, and *eḡşām* (Peymān, 1342 Š./1963, p. 151). The families within the *bonkū* are usually related, but non-kinsmen may also join. One example of this is the admission of *čūpānkāras* (guards for



sheep and goats) and *dārūgās* (guards for camels), who either alone or accompanied by their families camp together with the members of the *bonkū*.

Sometimes, but not always, the *bonkū* is divided into pastoral and agricultural cooperative units named *bīla* or *bīlak*. The number and size of the *bīlas* undergo constant change depending on the number of animals to be tended and the amount of agricultural and manual work to be done. The daily routines of the Qašqā'ī confederacy's people are actually arranged in *bīlas* and *bonkūs*. Consequently the *tīras* and *ṭāyefas* are somewhat abstract entities.

The subdivisions of the confederacy are of course not limited to the *ṭāyefa*, *tīra*, *bonkū*, and *bīla*. Sometimes a unit intermediate between the *tīra* and the *bonkū* is found, particularly in large *tīras*. This is why in some cases a single *tīra* has several headmen (*kadkodās*). Such a unit may fittingly be termed a sub-clan.

Seen as a whole, the Qašqā'ī confederacy is a pyramid headed by the *īl-kānī* and made up of *ṭāyefas*, each headed by a *kalāntar* (mayor or warden), *tīras*, each headed by a *kadkodā*, and *bonkūs*, each headed by a *rīš-saftīd* (white-beard, i.e., elder). Thanks to this organization, the Qašqā'ī tribes could be centrally controlled and led on semi-military lines. It must be added that the changes affecting the tribal system which took place after the Second World War did not leave the Qašqā'ī confederacy untouched. Their traditional structure was greatly weakened, particularly at the higher levels. It deserves study, however, as an example of the organization of a tribal confederacy.

More or less similar structures, with mainly terminological variations, are found in other confederacies. The Baḳtīārī confederacy, consisting of the two big groups (*bolūk*) of the Haft Lang and the Čahār Lang, was originally divided into a number of tribes, such as the Dūrakī, Behdārvand, and Bābādī in the Haft Lang, and the Mamīvand, Moḥammad Šāleḥ, Mūgūyī, and Kīānertī in the Čahār Lang. The Baḳtīārī term for these tribes is *bāb*, though *ṭāyefa* is sometimes also used. In contrast with the Qašqā'ī practice, each tribe (*bāb*) is considered to be itself a confederacy (*īl*); for example, the Dūrakī *īl* or *bāb*, which has always supplied the leading khans, is seen as a confederacy of its seven *ṭāyefas*, named Zarāsvand, Gandalī, Mūrī, Osīvand-e Bāmedī, Asterekī, Čārbūrī, and Sūhūnī (Digard, Persian tr., 1358 Š./1979, p. 60). Each *ṭāyefa* is made up of several *tīras*; the Zarāsvand, for example, of *tīras* named Tūšmal, Ālāsvand, Mīr, Zanbūr, and Īhāvand (Wezārat-e Ābādānī wa Maskan, 1348 Š./1969, *alef*, p. 235). Pasturage rights spring from membership of a *ṭāyefa*



(Karīmī, 1357 Š./1978, pp. 67-83). Each *tīra* is made up of several descent groups of the extended family type, which are called *taš* (i.e., *ātaš*) or *awlād*; during the seasonal migrations, each of these groups functions as a herding unit (*māl*) and camping unit (*ordū*) with from two to twelve tents pitched side by side (Digard, op. cit., p. 59).

Another report gives the same list of Baḳtīārī subdivisions with slight differences of detail; *īl* or *bāb* (tribe), *ṭāyefa*, *tīra*, *taš*, *karbū* (see below), and *kānavār* (family) (Wezārat-e Ābādānī wa Maskan, 1348 Š./1969, *alef*, pp. 32-33). In any case the close resemblance between the Baḳtīārī and Qašqā'ī structures is striking. The *māl* and the *karbū* (a smaller unit) among the Baḳtīārīs correspond to the *bonkū* and *bīla* among the Qašqā'īs and are herding groups; the *taš* or *awlād* is a descent group, and so too in one respect is the *bonkū*; the *tīra* and the *ṭāyefa* are administrative and political subdivisions, despite the importance of common descent or origin in the initial formation of *tīras*. Animal ownership lies with the *kānavār*, which is also the consumption unit.

The Bāšerī tribe, one of the components of the Ḳamsa confederacy in Fārs, is relatively small and probably for that reason has not developed a hierarchical structure of the type found in the province's Turkish and Arab tribes. It is divided directly into thirteen *tīras*, named Kolomba'ī, 'Abdūlī, Labū Mūsā, Jūčīn, 'Alī Šāhqolī, Zohrābī, Farhādī, Ḥanā'ī, Karamī, Sarvestānī, 'Alī Qanbarī, Ahl-e Qolī, and Īl-e Ḳāšš. Most of these *tīras*, and especially the populous ones, are made up of several *awlād*; in the Farhādī *tīra*, for example, there are two *awlād*, one called Bahmanī, of 65 families (*kūna*), the other called Farhādī, of 42 families. All, or more often some, of the members of an *awlād*, depending on the season and the year, form an *ordū* (camping group) ranging in size from 2 to 5 tents in winter and from 10 to 40 tents in other seasons, and they move together in search of pasturage for their flocks. It is therefore clear that the Bāšerī subdivisions are simplified forms of the basic elements of tribal structure (Amānallāhī, 1360 Š./1971, pp. 194-95; Barth, 1961, pp. 25, 51).

In some tribes the meanings of *ṭāyefa* and *tīra* are reversed; the tribe is first divided into *tīras*, and then the *tīra* into *ṭāyefas*. This is the practice among the Kūhgīlūya and Boir Aḥmadī tribes and also those of Īlām. In the case of the Bahme'ī tribe, first the tribe is divided into two sections called Moḥammadī and Aḥmadī, then each section into three *tīras*, and then each *tīra* into several *ṭāyefas*. The *taš* (or *daha* or *čāla*) is here a component of the *ṭāyefa*, and of course is made up of families (*bohūn*, i.e., tent). In seasonal migrations and agricultural operations, the *taš* acts as the herding unit (Afšār-e Nāderī, 1347



Š./1968, pp. 41-59). The same structure is found in the other tribes of the Kūhgīlūya *ostān* (Ṭāherī, 1355 Š./1976, p. 3). In some cases splitting of the herding units into smaller units named *qāš* is also mentioned. The subdivisions of the tribes of Lorestān show no real difference from those just described. They are *īl*, *ṭāyefa*, *tīra*, and *dūdmū* (i.e., *dūdmān*), but it is clear that in the local usage *īl* is equivalent to *ṭāyefa*, *ṭāyefa* to *tīra*, *tīra* to *taš*, and *dūdmū* to *māl* in the terminology of the big tribal confederacies such as the Baḳtīārī and the Qašqā'ī (Amānallāhī, p. 161).

This type of organization is not confined to the tribes of the central Zagros. Tribes living in the very different environment of Sistān and Baluchistan have developed rudiments of similar structures. This is apparent from a report on the Zayn-al-dīnī Balūčīs of the area around Espaka in the *dehestān* of Lāšār. They have at times been attached to the Šīrānīs and the Zamānīs, and they are under the influence of the Mobārakīs. In one respect they are a Mobārakī *ṭāyefa*. The Mobārakī *sardār* exercises supervision through the instrumentality of the headman of the Zayn-al-dīnī *ṭāyefa*, who is known locally as the *master* (a relic of the British presence in the region). Since the Zayn-al-dīnīs still make seasonal migrations to sheep pastures, their *ṭāyefa* is divided into herding groups named *ḥašam*. All the component families of a *ḥašam* are of the same lineage (in the local terminology, of the same *šalvār*, i.e., trouser). Land, pasturage rights, and livestock are jointly owned by the *ḥašam*. If the number of the *ḥašam*'s animals passes beyond a certain limit, the *ḥašam* has to be split into groups which are called *halk*, also *lowgān* (i.e., group of *lowgs* "huts") or *davār* or *mītag*. Neither the *ḥašam* nor the *halk* has a fixed membership, because the number of the component families is changed in accordance with the number of the animals. When the animals owned by a *halk* increase too much, some of the families are transferred together with the surplus animals to another *halk* which owns fewer animals, and the balance between families and animals is thereby maintained. A *halk*'s affairs are managed by its elder (*rīš-safīd* or *master*). In the mid 1970s, probably because the Balūč had been turning to agriculture and, above all, finding industrial-type work, the manpower-livestock ratio was unbalanced, and in some cases the number of families in a *halk* far exceeded the requirement for tending the animals. The dividing line between *ḥašam* and *halk* is often unclear, the former being sometimes used with the meaning of the latter.

In close proximity to the Zayn-al-dīnīs live some of the Nārū'īs, who in the past were a large and tightly knit tribe. Since the Nārū'īs are today mainly engaged



in agriculture, units such as the *halk* are not found among them. Instead, every Nārūī *tīra* has a “*master*” who is in fact the chief of an independent *ṭāyefa* or tribe. The same situation is found in other tribes which have ceased to be primarily pastoral; e.g., in a *ṭāyefa* of the Darzādas of the village of ‘Īsā ābād north of Espaka, who have no *ḥašams* or *halks* but have a single chief through whom they maintain contact with the Mobārakī *sardār*. At the village of Hičān in the *dehestān* of Nīkšahr, in which the Mobārakī, Ra’īsī, Darzāda, Dāwūdī, and Nowkarī *ṭāyefas* are settled, the *halk* has been maintained, even though there is no more need for it, but has acquired the character of a kin group consisting of families whose houses are side by side (Markaz-e Pažūheš-e Kalīj-e Fārs wa Daryā-ye ‘Omān, 1354 Š./1975, 1355 Š./1976, 1356 Š./1977).

As regards tribes in the north of Iran, a study of the Yomūt Turkmen of the Gorgān plain is available. Some of them are still mobile and mainly engaged in stock breeding and are known in local parlance as the *čārvā* (pastoral) people as opposed to the *čomūr* (agricultural) people. Mainly among the *čārvā* people, groups called *ūba*, each comprising between 25 and 100 families, are found. Pasturage and water rights in a defined area are jointly owned by all the members of an *ūba*. Within each *ūba*, small groups of two to ten (usually four to seven) men are formed annually for the cooperative performance of tasks and use of draft animals and implements. The families concerned are immediate relatives (fathers, sons, brothers, etc.), and they all camp together. Even so, the memberships of these small groups continually change.

Through the union of several *ūbas*, an entity known to the Yomūt Turkmen as an *īl* is formed, e.g., the Ja’far Bāy, Yelqī, and Qojūq *īls*. On this plane, *īl* means much the same as *tīra* or *ṭāyefa* among the Zagros tribes; but on a higher plane, the word *īl* is used to denote a confederacy of *īls* in the first sense, e.g., the Īl-e Šarīf, which is a confederacy of the Īl-e Ja’far Bāy, Īl-e Yelqī, and others. An *īl* in either sense is a structure based on patrilineal descent groups. Although these groups more or less coincide with the territorial groups such as the *ūba*, the membership of an *ūba* sometimes includes families not belonging to its main descent group; in the Yomūt parlance, such families are neighbors (*qūnšī*) (Irons, 1972, pp. 90-93).

(6) *Economy*. Sheep and goat breeding is the economic mainstay of the tribes of Iran, particularly those not yet sedentarized. They also breed large animals—bovines, buffalos, camels, horses, mules, and donkeys—for ploughing and load-carrying, and in some cases for their milk and hair. Yet it would be wrong to conclude that the tribal economy rests solely on



stockbreeding. Even for wholly nomadic tribes, agriculture, at least of the rain-fed (*deymi*) type, has long been an important resource, and it has become much more so in the recent past. The principal crops sown by the tribes are wheat, barley, and in some cases rice. When conditions permit, they also grow vegetables and plant orchards. Planting date palms is a widespread activity among Arab and Balūčī tribes. In addition to stockbreeding and agriculture, annual collection of wild plant and tree products, such as gum tragacanth, pine resin, wild almonds, acorns, and other nuts, is of considerable importance. In several tribes, acorn flour, sometimes mixed with wheat flour, is used to bake a sort of bread. With few exceptions, tribes-people engage in handicrafts, particularly carpet making and the weaving of *gelims* and *jaḡims* (smooth and rough woven rugs) and also embroidery, in which the Balūč have a tradition of skill. These manufactures, if sold, augment the incomes of tribal families, though the carpets and *gelims* are often retained as financial reserves or future dowries for daughters. Employment of tribesmen as laborers on farms and as shepherds within the tribe has long been widespread, but work opportunities for them on development projects and highways and in cities are a recent phenomenon. Canvas weaving, felt making, and construction of canvas or felt tents and brushwood or palm frond huts for use as family homes are important functions performed within the tribe. In a full economic analysis, all the above-mentioned activities should be taken into account.

It must be added that in past times raiding was an important source of income and wealth for tribes. They consequently did not see robbery as dishonorable. Names still borne by certain *tīras* and *ṭāyefas*, such as *sāreq* or *dozd* (thief), *galazan* (rustler), *ūḡorī* (marauder), are reminders of those times.

Nevertheless, the principal occupation of the nomadic tribes is sheep and goat breeding. Their income, wealth, and power all depend on its vicissitudes. Great variations in the number of animals per tribe and per family are found in the different tribal communities. These are shown in [Table 25](#) together with data on average animal ownership, flock composition, and cultivated area per family. It will be seen from Table 25 that the average number of sheep and goats per family varies between 6 and 120 from one tribal unit to another, while the actual numbers range between 0 and 350 from one family to another. The flock compositions are equally varied; for example, the ‘Aẓīm *ḥaṣam* of the Zayn-al-dīnīs had a flock consisting solely of goats and no large animals except camels, whereas the Bāṣerī *ordū* had a flock of which 64 percent were ewes together with an assortment of large animals. The last line



of Table 25 was obtained from the nationwide census of nomadic tribes taken by the Statistics Center of Iran; as noted above, the definition of the tribes in this census was so narrow that its figures unfortunately cannot be taken as generally valid for the whole tribal population. Not surprisingly, on this restricted definition, the average area under cultivation by nomadic tribes as calculated from the census return is less than one hectare per family, whereas in other computations it is between 3 and 8 hectares per family.

The animal products supplied by the tribes of Iran are normally lambs and kids for meat, wool, goat hair, ghee, dried whey (*kašk*), and in some cases sheep cheese. The sheep sold for meat are yearling or immature lambs (*šišak*) and, to a less extent, ewes which have become sterile after seven or eight lambings. The estimates of tribal output of animal products given in different publications are not fully consistent. In some statements the figures are theoretical, being based on the assumption that the animals are adequately nourished. In that case the birth rate of ewes and she-goats, after allowance for infant mortality, could of course be 90 percent or, given the possibility of two lambings in a year, even higher. Often in calculations of pastoral income, a suckling lamb or kid has been taken as equivalent to a ewe or she-goat. The same assumption is made with regard to lactation periods and milk yields and in the inferred estimates of ghee and whey output. Yet even in normal conditions, the lactation period of ewes and she-goats varies between 100 and 120 days and the daily milk yield between 200 and 600 grams. Moreover about 25 percent of the ewes and she-goats for one reason or another do not yield milk at all. Wool output is likewise far from uniform, varying between 800 and 2500 grams per sheep according to the breed (Forūg, 1355 Š./1976, pp. 10-11). If the Statistics Center's figures can be taken as representative, roughly 40 percent of the sheep and goats do not yield wool and hair (Markaz-e Āmār-e Īrān, 1355 Š./ 1976, *alef*, p. 19). Such being the case, the discrepancies in the figures given in different reports is not surprising. Comparison of the two sets of estimates quoted below in Table 26 will sufficiently illustrate the problem.

The income obtainable from animal products is of course dependent on the prices of the various items. The price of a lamb, for example, was 500 *rīāls* in 1341 Š./1962 and 5,500 *rīāls* in 1359 Š./1980. It has been calculated that the weighted average of prices of animal products rose in the 18-year period 1341 Š./1962-1359 S./1980 approximately 8.6 fold, i.e., at an average annual rate of 12.7 percent (Amānallāhī, 1360Š./1981, p. 69). Since the average annual rise of the (urban) cost of living index in the same period was 7 percent, the terms of



trade appear to have moved in favor of animal breeders at an average annual rate of 5.7 percent. The greater part of this growth in their income arose after 1357 Š./1978.

It is customary among the tribes to keep female lambs and kids for increase of the flock and to sell male lambs and kids when they have been out to graze for one year. Tribesmen who own no animals or for some reason have lost those which they owned can stay in the tribal community and, after working some years as shepherds for others, eventually acquire or reacquire a flock of their own.

The share of the tribes in the whole Iranian livestock sector is thought to be normally about one third or even one half, though no accurate statistics have been taken. The Statistics Center's tribal census of 1353 Š./1974, with its narrow terms of reference, returned figures which are too low. In it the tribes, defined as wholly nomadic, were found to own only 10 percent of the country's 75,000,000 livestock units (1 sheep or goat = 1 unit, 1 donkey = 3 units, 1 cow or ox = 4 units, etc.), specifically, sheep 11 percent, goats 21 percent, bovines 4 percent, horses 3 percent, mules 9 percent, donkeys 6 percent, and camels 46 percent. There can be no doubt, however, that the numbers of the livestock grazing on natural pastures are far greater than these.

As mentioned above, many tribes, while retaining their tribal structure, have in recent times made agriculture their principal activity. The present circumstances of such tribes will not be discussed here. It has already been noted that agriculture was a significant element in the traditional tribal economy. The *kūč* (transhumance) is combined with dry farming in both the *qešlāq* (winter quarters) and the *yeylāq* (summer quarters). For example, the Qašqā'ī tribesmen plough land in their *qešlāq* in the month of Esfand (February-March), replough it in the month of Farvardīn (March-April) before their move to their *yeylāq*, sow the seed in the autumn after their return to the *qešlāq*, and reap the crop late in Farvardīn or in early Ordībehešt of the following year, just before their next *kūč* to the *yeylāq*. Early in the autumn they plough and sow in the *yeylāq* before their move to the *qešlāq*, and they reap the crop in the summer after their return. In the *yeylāq* they sometimes cultivate vegetables as well as cereals (wheat, barley, and a little rice). By leaving half of the ploughed areas in fallow, they always have land available for sowing and cropping (Peymān, 1347 Š./1968, pp. 89-90).



In the case of another tribe, the Bālā Gerīva of Lorestān, which does not make long migrations like those of the Qašqā’ī but has summer and winter quarters only about 90 km or ten days trek apart, a different rhythm of cultivation and migration has been described. They reap their wheat crop early in the month of Tīr (June-July), plough and sow in the month of Šahrīvar (August-September), and then leave the land to itself. In the following year, after their return from the highlands (*sardsīr*), they again plough and sow wheat as soon as the first rains fall in the second half of Šahrīvar or early in the month of Mehr (September-October). They then spend the winter in the *garmsīr*. They set out for their *yeylāq* in the middle of Farvardīn (Amānallāhī, 1360 Š./1981, pp. 47-48).

As already noted, the making of carpets, *gelīms*, *ǰājīms*, and *korǰīns* (saddlebags) is pursued on a large scale by Iran’s tribes. For tribes which themselves produce the requisite wool, these activities were particularly advantageous when the wool price was low. Carpet making in the tribes is done solely by women and girls, who do not use cartoons but know the design by heart. In past times, tribal carpets were made entirely of wool, the warp and weft threads as well as the pile yarn being woolen; but the urban practice of using cotton warps and wefts, or at least cotton warps, took root in certain tribes after ca. 1960. The wool requirement for a square meter of carpet averages 3 kg of washed and spun wool, but varies locally and of course depends on the fineness of the knotting. Tribal carpet designs are geometrical, i.e., always have straight lines parallel, vertical, or at a 45° angle to each other, and never have curved lines; this is the main feature distinguishing tribal from urban carpets. A tribal carpet loom is not a vertical frame like the urban *dār*, but a horizontal brace which can be quite easily fixed, unfixed, and transported. (Edwards, 1953).

See also [AFGHANISTAN iv](#).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Works in Persian. Āmār-e ‘Omūmī, *Našrīya-ye āmār-e gozāreš-e kolāša-ye sar-šomārī-e ‘omūmī-e kešvar dar Ābānmāh-e 1335*, 2 vols., Tehran, 1339



Š./1960.

Ebn Kaldūn, *Moqaddema*, tr. M. Parvīn Gonābādī, II, Tehran, 3rd ed., 1352 Š./1973.

Abu'l-Fedā, *Taqwīm*, tr. 'A. Āyatī, Tehran, 1349 Š./1970.

N. Afšār(-e) Nāderī, *Īl-e Bahme'ī*, Tehran, 1347 Š./1968 (Mo'assasa-ye Moṭāla'at wa Taḥqīqāt-e Ejtemā'ī-e Dānešgāh-e Tehrān, stencilled).

Idem et al., *Jam'iyat o šenāsnāma-ye ilāt-e Kūhgīlūya*, Tehran, 1347 Š./1968 (stencilled). S. Amānallāhī, *Kūčnešīnī dar Īrān*, Tehran, 1360 Š./1981.

A. Owžan Baḳtīārī, "Tārīk-e Baḳtīārī," *Waḥīd* 2/11-12; 3/1 and 3, 1344 Š./1965.

'A.-R. Āyatallāhī, *Īlāt o 'ašāyer-e Fārs*, Shiraz, 1357 Š./1978.

M. -E. Bāstānī Pārīzī, *Wādī-e Ḥaftvād*, Tehran, 1355 Š./1976.

M. Bāvar, *Kūhgīlūya wa ilāt-e ān*, Gačsārān, 1324 Š./1945.

Bāybūrdī, *Tārīk-e Arasbārān*, Tehran, 1341 Š./1962.

M. Borqa'ī, *Čādonešīnān-e dāmdār-e il-e Torkāšvand: Taḡyīrāt-e eqtešādī wa ejtemā'ī dar do daha-ye aḳīr*, Hamadān, 1356 Š./1977 (Dānešgāh-e Bū 'Alī Sīnā, stencilled).

Moḥammad b. Naḳīb Bakrān, *Jahān-nāma*, ed. M. A. Rīāḥī, Tehran, 1342 Š./1963.

M. Bahman Bīgī, *'Orf o 'adat dar 'ašāyer-e Fārs*, Tehran, 1324 Š./1945.

Majmū'a-ye ketāb-e Āgāh: Īlāt o 'ašāyer, Tehran, 1362 Š./1983.

N. Pākdāman, *Āmār-nāma-ye eqtešādī-e Īrān dar āgāz-e jaṅg-e jahānī-e dovvom*, Tehran, 1355 Š./1976.

M. Parvīn Gonābādī, *Bargozīda-ye moštarek-e Yāqūt-e Ḥamawī*, Tehran, 1347 Š./1968.

H. Pūr-Karīm, "Torkmanhā-ye Īrān: Īnča Barūn," *Honar o mardom* 41-43, 1344-45 Š./1966; 50, 1345 Š./1966; 61-64, 1346 Š./1967-68; 71, 1347 Š./1968; 73, 1347 Š./1968; 79, 1348 Š./1969; 84, 1348 Š./1969.



- Idem, “Kordān-e Bāčlavānlū’i-e Qūčān,” *ibid.*, 88, 1348 Š./1969-70.
- H. Peymān, *Īl-e Qašqā’i*, Tehran, 1347 Š./1968 (Anstītū-ye Taḥqīqāt-e Behdāštī).
- K. Tawaḥoddī, *Ḥarakat-e tārikī-e Kord “Korāsān,”* Mašhad, 1359 Š./1980.
- ‘A. Ḥabībī, “Raf-e yak eštabāh dar bāra-ye tork wa tarak wa ašl-e kalaḡiān-e afgānī,” in M. Mīnovī and Ī. Afšār, eds., *Yādanāma-ye īrānī-e Mīnorskī*, Tehran, 1348 Š./1969.
- J. P. Digard, “Dar bāra-ye zarūrat-e Baḡtīārī būdan,” Pers. tr. in *Ketāb-e Jom’ā* 21, 1358 Š./1979-80.
- ‘A. Razmārā, *Joḡrāfiā-ye nezāmī-e Īrān*, Tehran, 1320 Š./1941.
- E. Restrepo, *Nazar-ī be ilāt-e Īrān o mas’ala-ye eskān*, Tehran, 1357 Š./1978.
- Ḳvāja Rašīd-al-dīn Faẓlallāh, *Jāme’ al-tawāriḡ*, ed. A. A. ‘Alizāda, I, Moscow, 1965.
- H. Refatī, *Čādornešinān-e dāmdār-e Malekšāhī dar Pošt-e Kūh*, Master’s thesis, Dānešgāh-e Tehrān, 1356 Š./1977.
- Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja, *‘Ašāyer-e maṇṭaqa-ye Kohgīluya*, Tehran, 1354 Š./1975 (stencilled).
- Idem, *Gozāreš-e waẓ’-e mawjūd-e jāme’a-ye ‘ašāyerī-e Īrān*, Kermānšāh, 3 vols., Proceedings of the Semīnār-e Barrasī-e Mas’el-e Jāme’a-ye ‘ašāyerī-e Īrān, 1355 Š./1976 (stencilled).
- J. Forūḡ, “‘Ašāyer wa dāmdārī,” Kermānšāhān, 1355 Š./1976 (*ibid.*, stencilled).
- ‘A. M. Sākī, *Joḡrāfiā-yetārikīwa tārik-e Lorestān*, Ḳorramābād, 1343 Š./1964.
- Ġ. -‘A. Šāmlū, “Īl-e Māmoš,” *Honar o mardom*, N.S. 1/7, 1342 Š./1963.
- Š. E. Šāh-‘ālamī, *Tārik-eḡālāt-e il-e Barbarī*, Mašhad, 1308 Š./1929.
- P. Šadaḡiānī, “Gozāreš-e sāzmān-e dāmdārān-e motaḡarrek,” in *Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja*, op. cit. (stencilled).
- J. Šafīnezād, *Aṡlas-e ilāt-e Kohgīluya*, Tehran, 1347 Š./1968 (Mo’assasa-ye Moṡāla’āt, stencilled).



- M. Żarrābī, “Ṭawāyef e Kohgīlūya,” *FIZ* 9, 1340 Š./1961.
- Idem, “Ṭawāyef-e Mīānāb,” *FIZ* 10, 1341 Š./1962.
- ‘A. Ṭāherī, *‘Ašāyer-e Kohgīlūya wa Boīr Aḥmad*, in *Sāzmān-e Barnāma wa Būdja*, op. cit. (stencilled).
- E. ‘Ajamī et. al., *Tīra-ye ‘Amala-ye Fārsīmadān*, 1352 Š./1973 (Baḵš-e ‘Omrān-e Mellī wa Jāme‘a-šenāsī-e Dānešgāh-e Šīrāz, stencilled).
- Fasā‘ī *Fārs-nāma*. J. Qā‘em-maqāmī, “‘Ašāyer-e Kūzestān: Ṭawāyef-e Šūš,” *Yādgar* 1/10, 1324 Š./1945.
- Idem, “‘Ašāyer-e Kūzestān: Ṭawāyef-e Mīānāb,” *ibid.*, 2/4, 1324 Š./1945; 8, 1325 Š./1946.
- M. Karīmzāda, “Šahsevānhā-ye Fārs,” *Honar o mardom* 13/ 137-138, 1352 Š./1974.
- A. Karīmī, “Nezām-e mālekīyat-e arzī dar īl-e Baḵtīārī,” *ibid.*, 189-190, 1357 Š./1978.
- A. H. Kešāvarz and ‘A. N. Rażawī, *‘Ašāyer wa masā‘el-e tawse‘a*, Tehran, 1355 Š./1976 (Mo‘assasa-ye Moṭāla‘āt, stencilled).
- B. Kelki et al., “Āgāhīhā-ī dar bāra-ye īlhā wa ṭāyefahā-ī az Ḷorramābād,” *Honar o mardom* 22, 1343 Š./1964.
- Komīsyūn-e Mellī-e UNESCO, *Īrānšahr*, Tehran, 1342 Š./1963.
- Kayhān, *Joḡrāfiā* II, passim. M. K. Mokrī, “‘Ašāyer-e Kord: Ṭawāyef-e Sanjābī,” *Yādgar* 4/6-10, 1326-27 Š./ 1948; 5/1-5, 1327 Š./1948-49.
- M. Lom‘a, “Kohgīlūya wa Boīr Aḥmad,” *Kūša* 12/34, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 1346 Š./1967.
- B. R. Lugashev, *Torkmanhā-ye Īrān*, Pers. tr. S. Īzādī and H. Taḥwīlī, Tehran, 1359 Š./1980.
- Y. Maḵīdzāda, “Īl-e Zarzā,” *Honar o mardom*, N.S. 8, 11, 1342 Š./1963; 24, 1343 Š./1964.
- Mardūk, *Tārīḵ-eKord wa Kordestān wa tawābe‘ yātārīḵ-eMardūk*, 4th ed.,



Sanandaĵ, 1351 Š./1972.

Markaz-e Āmār-e Īrān, *Saršomārī-e kešavarzi: Kānavārhā-ye motaḥarrek-e sāl-e 1353*, alef, Tehran, 1355 Š./1986.

Idem, *Rāhnamā-ye ma'mūr-e saršomārī*, ba, Tehran, 1355 Š./1976.

Idem, *Saršomārī-e 'omūmī-e nofūs wa maskan-e Ābānmāh-e 1355-e koll-e kešvar*, Tehran, 1359 Š./1980.

Markaz-e Pažūheš-e Kalīj-e Fārs wa Daryā-ye 'Omān, *Darāmad-ī moĵmal bar moṭāla'a-ye 'ašāyer-e Sīstān wa Balūčestān*, 2 vols., Tehran, 1354 Š./1975 (Sāzmān-e Barnāma, stencilled).

Idem, *Ṭāyefa-ye Mobārakī: Hīčān, Espaka, 'Isāābād, Zayn-al-dīnī, wa Čānf*, 5 vols., Tehran, 1355 Š./1976 (ibid., stencilled).

Idem, *Ṭāyefa-ye Mobārakī*, 2 vols., 1356 Š./1977 (ibid., stencilled).

Markaz-e 'Ašāyerī-e Īrān, *Jam'iyat wa taqsimāt-e ilī-e Īrān*, Tehran, 1360 Š./1981 (stencilled).

Mīrzā Moḥammad-Ḥosayn Mostawfī, *Āmār-e māli o neẓāmī dar Īrān dar 1128 yā tafsiḻ-e 'asāker-e firūzī mā'āter-e Šāh Solṭān Ḥosayn Šafawī*, published by M. T. Dānešpāžūh in *FIZ* 20, pp. 396-421.

'A. Najm-al-molk, *Safar-nāma-ye Kūzestān*, Tehran, 1341 Š./1962.

Wezārat-e Ābādānī wa Maskan, *Barrasī-e ilāt o 'ašāyer-e Baḳtīārī wa pišnehādāt-i barāye ābādānī-e sarzamīn-e ānhā*, alef, Tehran, 1348 Š./1969.

Idem, *Barrasīhā-ye ilāt wa 'ašāyer-e Balūčestān*, ba, Tehran, 1348 Š./1969 (stencilled).

Aḥmad-'Alī Khan Wazīrī Kermānī, *Joġrāftā-ye Kermān*, ed. M. -E. Bāsfānī Pārīzī, Tehran, 1353 Š./ 1974.

2. Works in other languages. N. Afshar Naderi, *The Settlement of Nomads*, Tehran, 1971 (Institute for Social Studies and Research of Tehran University).

A. Aghajanian, "Ethnic Inequality in Iran: An Overview," *IJMES* 15/2, 1983, pp. 211-24.



- D. Balland and Ch. M. Kieffer, "Nomadisme et Sécheresse en Afghanistan: L'exemples des nomades Paštun du Dašt-e Nāwor," *Pastoral Production and Society*, Cambridge, 1979.
- F. Barth, *Nomads of South Persia*, Oslo and London, 1961.
- L. Beck, "Nomads and Urbanites," *Middle Eastern Studies* 18/4, 1982, pp. 426-44.
- J. Black-Michaud, "An Ethnographic and Ecological Survey of Luristan, Western Persia: Modernization in a Nomadic Pastoral Society," *Middle East Studies* 10/2, 1974.
- C. S. Coon, "Iran. Demography and Ethnography," in *EI*² IV, pp. 7-11.
- G. N. Curzon, *Persia and the Persian Question*, 2 vols., London, 1892; 2nd ed., London, 1966.
- C. A. De Bode, *Travels in Luristan and Arabistan*, London, 1953.
- J. -P. Digard, "De la nécessité et des inconvénients pour un Baxtyâri, d'être Baxtyâri," *Production pastorale et société'*, Paris, 1979.
- Idem, "Nomadisme et organisation territoriale de Baxtyâri d'Iran," *ibid.*, no. 13, 1983.
- A. C. Edwards, *The Persian Carpet*, London, 1953.
- E. Ehlers and G. Stöber, "Entwicklungstendenzen des Nomadismus im Iran," in *Nomadismus, ein Entwicklungsproblem*, ed. J. Scholz, Berlin, 1982 (ample bibliography).
- C. G. Feilberg, *Les Papis*, Copenhagen, 1952.
- G. R. Garthwaite, *The Bakhtiari Khans: Tribal Disunity in Iran*, doctoral thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1969.
- Idem, "Pastoral Nomadism and Tribal Power," *Iranian Studies* 11, 1978.
- P. Hand, *Survey of the Tribes of Iran*, U.S. Army, 1963 (stencilled).
- A. Hotoum-Schindler, "Persia I. Geography and Statistics," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 10th ed., London, 1902.



- W. Irons, “Nomadism as a Political Adaptation: The Case of the Yomut Turkmen,” *American Ethnologist* 1/4, 1974.
- W. Ivanov, “Notes on the Ethnology of Khurasan,” *Geographical Journal* 67, 1926.
- A. K. S. Lambton, “Īlāt,” in *EI²* III, pp. 1095-1110.
- E. Lorini, *LaPersia economica contemporanea e la sua questione monetaria*, Rome, 1900.
- V. Minorsky, “The Gūrān,” *BSO(A)S* 2, 1943, pp. 75-103.
- P. Oberling, *The Qashqā’i Nomads of Fārs*, The Hague, 1974.
- C. Op’t Land, *The Shah-savan of Azarbaijan*, Tehran, 1961 (Institute for Social Studies and Research of Tehran University, stencilled).
- H. Rawlinson, “Notes on a March from Zohab at the Foot of the Zagros along the Mountain Roads of Khuzistan (Susiana) and from thence through the Province of Luristan to Kirmanshah in the Year 1836,” *JRGS* 9, 1839.
- J. Reid, *Tribalism and Society in Iran 1500-1629*, Malibu, Calif, 1983.
- B. Spooner, “Kūch and Balūch and Ichhyophagi,” *Iran* 2, 1964, pp. 53-67.
- Idem, *Religious and Political Leadership in Persian Baluchistan*, doctoral thesis, Oxford University, 1967.
- P. C. Salzman, “Adaptation and Political Organization in Iranian Baluchistan,” *Ethnology* 10/4, 1971.
- Idem, “Multi-Resource Nomadism in Iranian Baluchistan,” in W. Irons and N. Dyson-Hudson, eds., *Perspective on Nomadism*, Leiden, 1972.
- G. Schweizer, “Nordost-Azerbaidshan und Schah Sevan-Nomaden,” in *Strukturwandlungen im nomadisch-bäuerlichen Lebensraum des Orients*, Wiesbaden, 1970.
- Lady M. L. Sheil, *Glimpses of Life and Manner in Persia*, London, 1856.
- Sobotsinskiĭ, “Persiya,” in C. Issawi, ed., *The Economic History of Iran, 1800-1914*, Chicago, 1971.



G. Stober, *Die Afshar: Nomadismus im Raum Kerman (Zentral-Iran)*, Marburger Geographische Schriften 76, Marburg, 1978.

E. Sunderland, in *Camb. Hist. Iran I*, pp. 611-83.

R. L. Tapper, *The Shahsevan of Azarbaijan: A Study of Political and Economic Change in a Middle Eastern Tribal Society*, doctoral thesis, University of London, 1971.

Idem, *Pasture and Politics, Economics, Conflict, and Ritual among the Shahsevan Nomads of Northwestern Iran*, London, 1979.

Idem, ed., *The Conflict of Tribe and State in Iran and Afghanistan*, London and New York, 1983.

R. F. Thomson, "La Perse, sa population, ses revenus, son armée, son commerce," *Bulletin de la Société de géographie de Paris*, 1869.

A. T. Wilson, "The Bakhtiaris," *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, 1926.

See also the following articles in *EI*¹⁻²: Afshār, Bakhtiyārī, Balūčistān, Ghuzz, Kāshkāy, Kurdistan, Lak, Lur, Lur-i Buzurg, Lur-i Kūčik, Luristān, Mūḳān, Sāwdj-Bulāḳ Seldjuḳs, Shāh-sewan, Shaḳāḳī, Shūl Shūlīstan, Turkomans, Urmīya.

For more recent studies see *Abstracta Iranica* I-VII, Leiden, 1978-84. See also *Camb. Hist. Iran I*, pp. 409-18, and IV-VI, indices.