(see Dörpfeld, *Die* *Verwendung Ton Terraeotten,* Berlin, 1881, and Terracotta). The great temple of Zeus @@1 (G in fig.) was the largest peripteral temple of the whole Hellenic world, being almost exactly the same size as the enormous pseudo - peripteral Olympeæum at the neighbouring Agrigentum. It was octastyle, pseudo­dipteral, with seventeen columns on the sides, and measures 360 by 162 feet; the columns are 10 feet 7⅛ inches at the base and were 48 feet 7 inches high. This gigantic building was never quite completed, though the whole of the main structure was built. Most of the columns still remain unfluted. In spite of the propor­tional narrowness of its cella, it had an internal range of columns, probably two orders high, like those within the cella at Pæstum. The axes of these last three temples have exactly the same inclina­tion as those on the acropolis. The great temple of Zeus possesses some of the curious archaisms of the acropolis temples, and, though never completed, it was probably designed and begun at an earlier date than the two adjacent buildings. These peculiarities are the ungracefully rapid diminution of the shaft and the cavetto under the necking of the capitals. The whole of these six massive build­ings now lie in a complete state of ruin, a work of evidently wilful destruction on the part of the Carthaginians, as the temple at Segesta, not many miles distant, has still every column and its whole entablature quite perfect ; so it is impossible to suppose that an earthquake was the cause of the utter ruin at Selinus. Few or no marks of fire are visible on the stone blocks. (J. H. M.)

SELJÚḲS is the name of several Turkish dynasties, issued from one family, which reigned over large parts of Asia in the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries of our era. The history of the Seljúḳs forms the first part of the his­tory of the Turkish empire. Proceeding from the deserts of Turkestan, the Seljúḳs reached the Hellespont; but this barrier was crossed and a European power founded by the Ottomans (Osmanli). The Seljúḳs inherited the traditions and at the same time the power of the previous Arabian empire, of which, when they made their appearance, only the shadow remained in the person of the 'Abbásid caliph of Baghdád. It is their merit from a Mohammedan point of view to have re-established the power of orthodox Islam and delivered the Moslem world from the supremacy of the caliph’s Shi'ite competitors, the Fátimites of Egypt, and from the subversive influence of ultra-Shí'ite tenets, which constituted a serious danger to the duration of Islam itself. Neither had civilization anything to fear from them, since they represented a strong neutral power, which made the intimate union of Persian and Arabian elements possible, almost at the expense of the national Turkish,— literary monuments in that language being during the whole period of the Seljuk rule exceedingly rare.

The first Seljúḳ rulers were Toghrul Beg, Chaḳir Beg, and Ibrahim Niyál, the sons of Mikail, the son of Seljúḳ, the son of Tuḳáḳ (also styled Timúryáliḳ, “ iron bow ”). They belonged to the Turkish tribe of the Ghuzz (Oυ^bt of Const. Porphyr. and the Byzantine writers), which traced its lineage to Oghuz, the famous eponymic hero not only of this but of all Turkish tribes. There arose, however, at some undefined epoch a strife on the part of this tribe and some others with the rest of the Turks, because, as the latter allege, Ghuzz, the son (or grandson) of Yafeth (Japhet), the son of Núh (Noah), had stolen the genuine *rain-stοne,* which Turk, also a son of Yafeth, had inherited from his father. By this party, as appears from this tradition, the Ghuzz were not considered to be genuine Turks, but to be Turkmans (that is, according to a popular etymology, resembling Turks). But the native tradition of the Ghuzz was unquestionably right, as they spoke a pure Turkish dialect. The fact, however, remains that there existed a certain animosity between the Ghuzz and their allies and the rest of the Turks, which increased as the former became converted to Islam (in the course of the 4th century of the Flight). The Ghuzz were settled at that time in Transoxiana, especially at Jand, a well-

@@@1 The dedication of the five smaller temples is unknown ; some were probably consecrated to Poseidon, Apollo, and Artemis. The existing metope reliefs are preserved in the museum at Palermo.

known city on the banks of the Jaxartes, not far from its mouth. Some of them served in the armies of the Ghazna- vids Sebuktegín and Mahmúd (997-1030); but the Seljúḳs, a royal family among them, had various relations with the reigning princes of Transoxiana and Khárizm, which can­not be narrated here. @@2 But, friends or foes, the Ghuzz became a serious danger to the adjoining Mohammedan provinces from their predatory habits and continual raids, and the more so as they were very numerous. It may suffice to mention that, under the leadership of Israil or Pígu Arslán, they crossed the Oxus and spread over the eastern provinces of Persia, everywhere plundering and de­stroying. The imprisonment of this chieftain by Mas'úd, the son and successor of Mahmúd, was of no avail : it only furnished his nephews with a ready pretext to cross the Oxus likewise in arms against the Ghaznavids. We pass over their first conflicts and the unsuccessful agreements that were attempted, to mention the decisive battle near Merv (1040), in which Mas'úd was totally defeated and driven back to Ghazna (Ghazni). Persia now lay open to the victors, who proclaimed themselves independent at Merv (which became from that time the official capital of the principal branch of the Seljúḳs), and acknowledged Toghrul Beg as chief of the whole family. After this victory the three princes Toghrul Beg, Chaḳir Beg, and Ibrahim Niyál separated in different directions and con­quered the Mohammedan provinces east of the Tigris ; the last-named, after conquering Hamadán and the province of Jebel, penetrated as early as 1048, with fresh Ghuzz troops, into Armenia and reached Melazkerd, Erzerúm (Erzeroum), and Trebizond. This excited the jealousy of Toghrul Beg, who summoned him to give up Hamadán and the fortresses of Jebel ; but Ibrahim refused, and the progress of the Seljúḳian arms was for some time checked by internal discord,—an ever-recurring event in their history. Ibrahim was, however, compelled to submit.

At this time the power of the 'Abbásid caliph of Baghdád (Al-Káim bi-amr illáh) was reduced to a mere shadow, as the Shi'ite dynasty of the Búyids and after­wards his more formidable Fáṭimite rivals had left him almost wholly destitute of authority. The real ruler at Baghdád was a Turk named Basásírí, lieutenant of the last Búyid, Al-Malik ar-Rahím. Nothing could, therefore, be more acceptable to the caliph than the protection of the orthodox Toghrul Beg, whose name was read in the official prayer (khotba) as early as 1050. At the end of the same year the Seljúḳ entered the city and after a tumult seized the person of Malik ar-Rahím. Basásírí had the good fortune to be out of his reach ; after acknowledging the right of the Fátimites, he gathered fresh troops and in­cited Ibrahim Niyál to rebel again, and he succeeded so far that he re-entered Baghdád at the close of 1058. The next year, however, Toghrul Beg got rid of both his antagonists, Ibrahim being taken prisoner and strangled with the bowstring, while Basásiri fell in battle. Toghrul Beg now re-entered Baghdád, re-established the caliph, and was betrothed to his daughter, but died before the consummation of the nuptials (September 1063). Alp Arslán, the son of Chaḳir Beg, succeeded his uncle and extended the rule of his family beyond the former frontiers. He made himself master, *e.g.,* of the important city of Aleppo ; and during his reign a Turkish emir, Atsiz, wrested Palestine and Syria from the hands of the Fátim­ites. Nothing, however, added more to his fame than his successful expeditions against the Greeks, especially that of 1071, in which the Greek emperor Romanus Diogenes was taken prisoner and forced to ransom himself for a

@@@2 Comp. Sachau, “Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwárizm,” in *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Acad., lxxiv. 304 *sq.*