al-Din Yazdi, ed. Ilahid, 1885, i, 124), and this appears to be on the site of the ancient town of Çağlıyan (thus Barthold, Turkestan, 72; Markwart, Wehret, 93). There is mention of Çağlıyan on only one further occasion, in the Bahrn-NAME (ed. Beveridge, 1905, index), where it is probably a historical reminiscence. Apparently no medieval ruins have survived in Çağlıyan, and the old settlements have vanished. Today the district belongs to the Özbek SSR, and the Özbek language has supplanted the old Iranian. The regions to the east of the Kafirnaghin river, however, together with Kababdiyan, belong to the Tadjik language area and to the Tadjik SSR.

**Bibliography:** W. Barthold, Turkestan, index; Le Strange, 435-40; J. Markwart, Wehret und Arang, 1938, index; Hudda al-Alam, index; B. Spuler, Iran, index. (B. Spuler)

**ÇAGHAN-RÖD (ÇAGHÂN-RÖMD),** the seventh and last tributary on the right of the river Amu-Daryâ [q.v.]. It comes from the Buttan mountains, to the north of Çağlıyan [q.v.], flows past that town and several smaller places, and finally into the Amu-Daryâ above Tirmîrî. The river is called by this name only in the Hudda al-Alam, (71, no. ii, p. 363), and in Şahrâ al-Dîn ‘Ali Yazdi, Bahrn-NAME (ed. Ilahid), 1885, i, 156 (= translation by F. Petri de la Croix, i, 185). Mukkaddesi, 22, calls it “river of Çağlıyan”, and distinguishes it from the Kafîrin-hân, the 6th tributary (further to the east) of the Amu-Daryâ. Ibn Rusta, (BGA vii, 93), on the other hand, gets the two rivers their sources, and their tributaries mixed up; he calls the Çaghan-Röd: Zâmi/Zoomul. Today, the upper part of the river is known as Kara Tağh Daryâ, and from Dih-i Now (Dênaw = Çağlıyan) onwards: Surkhân.

**Bibliography:** Le Strange, 436, 440; W. Barthold, Turkestan, 72; J. Markwart, Wehret und Arang, 1938, 89-94 (he attempts a classification of the pre-Islamic Iranian sources); B. Spuler, Der Amudari, 234 (in Jean Deny Armaugau, Ankara 1958, 231-48); Brockhaus-Efron, Eincklopf. Slovar xxvii l (= 63), St. Petersburg 1901, 109; Bol’shaya Sovetskaya Eincklopf. 4, (1950) 375. (B. Spuler)

**ÇAGHÂTAY KHÂN, founder of the Çağhatay Khânate [q.v.],** the second son of Çingiz Khân and his chief wife Börte Fejdir. Already in his father’s lifetime he was regarded as the greatest authority on the Yasa (the tribal laws of the Mongols as codified by Çingiz Khân). Like his brothers he took part in his father’s campaigns against China (1212-1216) and against the kingdom of the Khârzem-Shâh (1219-1224). Ulgândji, the latter’s capital, was besieged by the three princes Djici, Çağhatay and Ögedey and taken in Safr 618/27th March-24th April 1221. In the same year Çağhatay’s eldest son Mûetikên was slain before Bâmyan. After the battle on the Indus (according to Nasawi, translo. Houdas, 83, on Wednesday 7 Shawwât 618, probably 26 November 1221) Çağhatay was entrusted with operations against Sultan Djâljâl al-Dîn Khârzem-Shâh and spent the winter of 1221-1222 in India. During Çingiz-Khân’s final campaign against the Çingiz-Khân and spent the winter of 1221-1222 in India. During Çingiz-Khân’s final campaign against the Tangut (1225-1227) he remained in Mongolia in command of the forces left behind there. After his father’s death Çağhatay no longer took an active part in any of the campaigns. As the eldest surviving son of Çingiz-Khân (his brother Djici had predeceased his father) he enjoyed enormous prestige. In the year 1229 he presided with his uncle Ötögin over the kurîlât at which Ögedey was elected Great Khân: owing to his position as the recognized authority on the yasa, he exercised an influence to which even the Great Khân Ögedey had to bow. He seems to have spent this period partly in Mongolia at his brother’s court, partly in the territory allotted to him by Çingiz-Khân, where he held his own court-camp. Like all the Mongol princes Çağhatay had separate camps (ordu) for winter and summer. His summer residence according to Djuyun was at some place on the Ili whilst his winter quarters were at Kuyas, probably to be identified with the Equius of William of Rubruck, near Aimaligh, i.e., in the region of the present-day Kulja. The residence of Çağhatay’s successors is called Uliûh Ef (in Turkish „Great House”) by Djuyun and others.

Çaghatay had received from his father all the lands from the Uyghur territory in the east to Bukhârâ and Samarkand in the west: we must not however regard these lands as a single kingdom governed from the Ili valley and only indirectly subject to the Great Khân. Everywhere, even in the Ili valley itself, the local dynasties who were there before the Mongols remained. On the relationship of these dynasties to the Mongols we have no accurate information: we know equally little about what sovereign rights the court on the Ili could claim from the Great Khân and his deputies. The settled lands of Central Asia were certainly not governed in the name of Çağhatay but in that of the Great Khân. In the account of the suppression of the rebellion in Bukhârâ in 636/1238-1239 Çağhatay is not mentioned; the governor of Mâ warâ al-Nahr at this period was Mahmûd Yalaâvâ, a Khârizmi by birth, who had been appointed by the Great Khân. Even the generals of the Mongol forces in Mâ warâ al-Nahr were appointed by the Great Khân. When, soon afterwards, Mahmûd Yalaâvâ was arbitrarily dismissed from his office by Çağhatay the latter was called to account by his brother and had to admit the illegality of his action. Ögedey was satisfied with this apology and granted the land to his brother as a fief (infdû); but the legal position of this territory was not thereby altered. During the last years of Ögedey’s reign, as well as under Môngke, all settled areas from the Chinese frontier to Bukhârâ were governed by Masûd Beg, the son of Mahmûd Yalaâvâ, in the name of the Great Khân.

It cannot be ascertained how far Çağhatay’s Muslim minister Kthâl al-Dîn Habash ﹶ‘Amîd had a share in the administration of the country along with the representatives of the Great Khân. According to Rashid al-Dîn this minister came from Otrar, according to Djîmâl Karshî from Karmina, and like many other Muslim dignitaries at this time had made his fortune among the Mongols as a merchant. He was on terms of such intimacy with the Khân that each of Çağhatay’s sons had one of Habash ‘Amid’s sons as a companion.

In general Çağhatay was not favourably inclined towards Islam. Among the infringements of Mongol law which he rigidly punished was the observance of certain prescriptions of Islam. Among the Mongols it was forbidden to slaughter an animal by cutting its throat, which is the method prescribed by the shari’a; another law frequently broken by the Muslims at their ablations was that which prohibited washing in running water. The cruel punishment which Çağhatay visited upon any such transgressions made his name hated among the Muslims.
According to Djuwayni, Caghatay survived his brother Ögedey, who died on 5 Djamād Al-Fīrād, 1128, though only for a short period. On the other hand Rashid al-Din states that he died seven months before Ögedey, i.e., apparently in the beginning of May, 1241.


CAGHATAY KHĀNATE. The Central Asian Khanate to which Caghatay gave his name was really not founded till some decades after the Mongol prince's death. Caghatay was succeeded by his grandson Kara-Hülegü, the son of Mö'etüken who fell at Bamiyan. Kara-Hülegü had been designated as Caghatay's heir both by Cóng-Qizh Khan himself and by Ögedey; he was however deposed by the Great Khan Güyük (1241-1248) in favour of Yesū-Mönge, the fifth son of Caghatay, with whom Güyük was on terms of personal friendship. In 1251 Yseū-Mönge was involved in the conflict against the Great Khan Mönge, who reinstated Kara-Hülegü and handed Yseū-Mönge over to him for execution. Kara-Hülegü however did not survive the homeward journey and the execution was carried out by his widow, Princess Orkina, who now ruled in her husband's stead, though her authority does not seem to have extended beyond the Ili valley. As appears from the narrative of William of Rubruck, the whole Empire was at this period divided between Mönge and Batu: Batu's portion was the whole area west of a line between the rivers Talas and Cu, east of which all territories were directly subject to the Great Khan. Mas'ud Beg (see the previous article), who enjoyed the confidence of both Khans, was governor of all the settled areas between Besh-Balch and Khārizm.

With the death of the Great Khan Mönge in 1259 a different condition of things arose. During the struggle for supremacy between Kubilay and Arlh Böke, the brothers of the late Khan, Alphu, a grandson of Caghatay, agreed to take possession of Central Asia for Arlh Böke and support him from that quarter against his enemies. He actually succeeded in bringing the whole of Central Asia under his sway, including areas such as Khārizm and that of the Qara-Hülegü and Orkina, the first Caghatay to convert to Islam, was proclaimed Khān in March 1266. Already in the same year he was dethroned by his cousin Burak (or rather Barak) Khān [c.a.], the nominee of the Great Khan, who was soon however to become little more than a satellite of Kuydu [c.a.], the real master of Central Asia. After Kuydu's death in 1274 Kuydu appointed Nirkay, a grandson of Caghatay, to succeed him; Nirkay was followed by Buka-Temür, another grandson of Caghatay; and in 1282, Kuydu's choice fell upon Dur, the son of Burak. The faithful ally of Kuydu in all his wars against the Great Khan, Dur was defeated and deposed his son Capar shortly before his own death in 1306 or 1307. The Caghatay Khanate was from now on to remain in Dur's family almost to the moment of its extinction, the throne being occupied, for longer or shorter periods, by six of his sons, of whom we need mention here only Esen-Buğa (1309-1318), Kebek (1318-1326) and Tarmashirin (1326-1334).

It was some time before the Caghatay Khanate received an independent organisation of its own. Djamal Karšī's work, written in the reign of Capar shows that affairs in Central Asia were in much the same condition even at this period, when there had long been a strong Mongol central government in China and Persia, as they had been in the early years of the Mongol conquest. The Mongols were apparently less under the influence of Islam and Muslim culture than in Persia and were able to preserve their own peculiar ways of life for a much longer period of time. Except in the Uyghur country, Islam was everywhere the state religion by the time of the Mongol conquest, even in the Ili valley, although these areas had been little influenced by Arabo-Persian culture. The Mongol conquest, as Rubruck pointed out, was followed in these regions by an extension of the pasture lands at the expense of the towns and cultivated areas; at a later period urban life altogether disappeared under the influence of Mongol rule, except in Mao wara al-Nahr and the present-day Sinkiang. The Muslim civilisation of Mao wara al-Nahr naturally exercised some influence on the Mongols, particularly the rulers; but this influence was not strong enough to induce the mass of the people to change their mode of life. When the ruling family decided to settle in Mao wara al-Nahr and break with the customs of the people, their action resulted in the complete separation of the eastern provinces.

Even the brief reign of Yesū-Mönge (1246-1251) appears to have been favourable to those who professed Islam. The chief minister then was a friend of the Khān's youth and a foster-son of Habash Āmad, Bahā al-Dīn Marghānāi, a descendant of the Shaikhās al-Islām of Farahān. As a patron of the poets and scholars he is praised by his contemporary Djuwayni, who was personally acquainted with him. Habash Āmad, who was hated by the Khān as an adherent of Kara-Hülegü, owed his life to the intercession of Bahā al-Dīn. Nevertheless, when Bahā al-Dīn was involved in his master's downfall, he was handed over to his foster-father, who ordered his execution in the cruellest fashion.

Under Orkina, Habash Āmad again occupied the position he had held under Caghatay; this prince however was favourably inclined to the Muslims; she is described by Wάσά as a protectress of Islam and by Djamal Karšī was even said to be a Muslim. Her son Mubarak-Shāh, raised to the throne in Mao wara al-Nahr, certainly adopted Islam, as did his rival Burak Khān some years later. The rule of Alphu seems to have been less favourable to the Muslims, and the events of the following years postponed for several decades the final victory of Muslim culture. Kuydu and Capar, as well as Dar and other princes, remained pagans and resided in the eastern provinces. In the reign of Esen-Buğa the armies of the Great Khan penetrated deep into Central Asia and ravaged the winter and summer.
West, or of the West in Muslim countries? It would of course be paradoxical to contend that among the members of the two geographically close populations there was no exchange of knowledge. But examination of institutions in the Latin East shows fewer borrowings from the Muslim past and less social intermingling than in the Christian States of Sicily and Spain. Similarly, from a cultural point of view, objective comparison leads to the categorical conclusion that where the West has acquired knowledge of Muslim civilization, it has done so mainly through Spain or Sicily and not through Western settlements in the East or Crusaders from the West; moreover, Islam as such nearly always remained misunderstood and the few accurate ideas about it that the West finally acquired are due to the efforts of missionaries, in other words to work undertaken in an entirely different spirit from the spirit of the Crusades. As for the Muslims, although some showed a certain curiosity about the Franks in the East or about a Western leader as exceptional as Frederick II, it must be acknowledged that their historians, geographers and anti-Christian polemists still had after the Crusades the same few notions about the European West, gleaned from their co-religionists in the West, that they had had before. Therefore, and contrary I regret to current opinion, it seems to me an anachronism to repeat with those who have worked on the cultural or political influence, indeed a very real one, of modern France in the East, or written within that context, that the Crusades laid their foundations; if in their own way they bore witness to the beginning of a process of interpenetration, the atmosphere they created proved subsequently more of a hindrance than a help.

Bibliography: The Arabic sources of the history of the Crusades are catalogued in C. Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades, 1940, 33-94; without however certain elucidations which may be found particularly in (besides a forthcoming work by N. Elisséeff on Nūr al-Dīn) H. A. R. Gibb, The Arabic sources for the life of Saladin, in Speculum, xxv (1950); B. Lewis, The sources for the history of the Syrian Assassins, ibid., xxvii (1952); H. Gottschalk, al-Malik al-Kāmil, 1958, Introduction. The five volumes of Historiens Arabes in the Recueil des Historiens des Croisades published by the Académie des Inscriptions sans need of method in the choice of extracts and insufficient care in the establishment and translation of texts (not to mention their inconvenient format); they have still not yet however been replaced by editions or above all, for those who need them, by better translations. Since 1940 have appeared—and we quote only the essential—a French translation by R. Le Tourneau of Ibn al-Kalânî's Damascus chronicle (Damas de 773 à 7154, French Institute in Damascus, 1952), vol. i of a new and this time good edition of Abū Shāma's K. al-Rawdatayn by M. A. Hilmi (Cairo 1957), as well as an edition of his Dhāyil (Cairo 1947); the first two volumes, less important than those to follow, of a good edition of Ibn Wāsīl's Mu'arridī al-Kurūb by al-Shayyāl (Cairo 1953 and 1957); an edition of the Ayyūbid part of al-Mašir b. al-'Āmid's chronicle by C. Cahen (in BEO, Damascus, xv, 1955-57); the edition of part of Ibn 'Abd al-Ẓahir's life of Baybars, under the title titulos of the East, by S. F. Sadouque, Oxford and Dacca 1956; the first two volumes out of the three of the excellent edition of (Kamāl al-Dīn) Ibn al-'Adīn's Zuhdā by Sāmī Dahān (Fr. Inst. Damascus, 1951 and 54) and, by the same editor, the part on Damascus of Ibn Shaddād's A'īdāb (Fr. Inst. Damascus, 1956), with the part on Aleppo edited by D. Sourdel (ibid., 1958); of the extant half of the Life of Baybars by the same author (in the absence of any edition) there is a Turkish translation by Şerifuddin Yaltkaya, Istanbul 1941; an edition by C. Zirayk and S. Iszidin, 1929-42, of the two volumes by Ibn al-Furāt on the years 672-696; an edition at Haydarābād, 2 vol. 1954-55, of the part of Yūnīn covering the years 664-670; and finally for the years 689-698 an analysis of Dījarī by J. Sauvaget, 1949. None of these authors of course deals specifically with the Crusades. A good number of selected and translated texts, together with useful introductions, has been given by Fr. Gabrieli, Storici Arabi delle Crociate, 1957.

For the general history of the Crusades in their Eastern setting reference should be made to the general works of Grousset, Runciman, my Syrie du Nord and the collective History of the Crusades by the University of Philadelphia under the supervision of K. M. Setton, vol. i (twelfth century) 1955, vol. ii (thirteenth century) in the press, and three further volumes on the later Crusades, institutions and civilization. A broadly conceived general bibliography of the Crusades will be found in H. E. Mayer, Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, Hanover 1960. It seems useful here only to indicate the few studies devoted particularly to aspects of the problems treated above: C. Cahen has given the outlines of a forthcoming Auver des Croisades, Points de vue d'Orient et d'Occident, in En quoi la Conquête turque appelait-elle la Croisade (Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres, Strasbourg, Nov. 1950), An Introduction to the First Crusade (Past and Present, 1954) and Les Institutions de l'Orient Latin, in Oriente e Occidente, XII Convegno Volta, 1956. The only other studies which need be quoted here are: H. A. R. Gibb, The achievement of Saladin in Bull. of the John Rylands Library, 1952; A. S. 'Atiyah, The Crusades, Old ideas and new conceptions in Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale Journal of World History, ii, 1954; and, on a much broader theme, U. Monneret de Villard, Lo studio dell' Islam nel XII e XIII secolo, in Studi e Testi, cx (1948), and A. Malvezzi, L'islamismo e la cultura europea, n.d. [1957] (the history of the knowledge of Islam).

(C. CAHEN)

CRYSTAL [see billawr]

CU, a river in Central Asia, 1090 km. long, but not navigable because of its strong current. It is now known as Çhā (Barthold, Foi. 50) by the Kirgias who live there (and it probably had this name when the Turks lived there in the Middle Ages); Chinese: Su-yeh or Sui-chi, modern Chinese: Çčú (for the problem of the indication of Çu = Chinese 'pearl' with the Pearl River (Yinčū Ēgzū) in the Orkhon Inscriptions, cf. the article Sīr Daryā). The river Cu has its source in Terskei Alatau, and then flows to the north-east until 6 km. from the western end of the Issik Kul [q.v.], known as Kočkar in its upper regions (for the first time in Şharaal al-Dīn 'All Yaţid, ed. Ilhāhhādā, 1, Calcutta 1885, 274). It send a branch (called the Kutenaalid) to the lake, which up to now is called the Sow. Subsequently the Ĉu turns northwards through the Böghām (Russian: Buam) ravine (this is mentioned first in Şharaal al-
Din, loc. cit.; in Gardzíl, 102: Dill, supposedly "arrow"), which lies to the north-west of the end of the Issik Kul, and then flows in a north-westly direction. In this region it receives the waters of the Great and the Little Kebin from its right, and the Aksu and Kuragati from the left. The river then flows through dreary waste-land in its middle and lower course. 110 km. east of the Amū Daryā [q.v.], it ends in the small desert lake Saumal-Kul.

The regions adjoining the upper Ču, which were good grazing land and could be easily irrigated, were already inhabited in the times of the Middle Siberean Andronovo culture (1700-1200 B.C.) (Bernstamm, 20). Later on, Sacae and Wusun (pseudo Tokharians?) lived on its banks. In the 6th and 7th centuries, these were joined by the Soghdians (see Sogdān) (Alti Čub Sogdī, in the Orqon inscriptions: Bernstamm, 26). Archaeological traces of these peoples have been found and described by the Soviet expert Aleksandr Natanovič Bernstamm (1910-1956). From his research, it has become evident that Syrian and some Byzantine influences had reached as far as this, and that the traffic from Further Asia to the Land of the Seven Rivers (Yeti Suw; Russ. Semireč'ë; cf. also Ilī) passed through this region along two ancient trade-routes (through the Kastek pass to the Īl valley, and through the Bōghām pass to the south side of the Issik Kul). Thus two cultures met on the banks of the Ču (down to the Land of the Seven Rivers and the Fargāhāna Basin (Bernstamm, 147, 262).

In 776, the Karšuk [q.v.] occupied the valley of the Ču and that of the Tārāz (Talas), and the area along both sides of the Alexander Mountains. The Turkis also settled there (Hudūd al-Ālam, 300; Barthold, Vost., 759). Sūyā [q.v.] was the capital of the Ču valley (Kāshghāri, iii, 305; Husān-Cuáng, ed. St. Julien, Paris 1857-8); the residence of the ruler of this area was usually in Kūzd Ordu (Balassaghūn; [q.v.]). Judging from the traces of settlements found, the valley was well populated at that time. The inhabitants developed a particular multi-coloured style in ceramics, and later also a distinct special form of ornamental Kūfic writing. There was a marked distinction between them and the other Transoxania (Bernstamm, 157, 12716).

Islamic armies reached the western part of the Ču valley only once, in 1393/140 (battle against Kūlān, cf. Ibn al-Asbīr, vi, 134), and the name of the river is not mentioned in Muslim sources of pre-Mongol times, although there is mention of some of the places in the region (Ibn Khurrahādbihih (IBG VI, 29); Kūdāmā, K. al-Khāridē (IBG), 206). Islam reached the population only in the 4th/10th century, and even around the year 572/982, only a part of the inhabitants of Tārāz and Nawēkād had become Muslims (Hudūd al-Ālam, 119, no. 93: 358, with mention of individual places); Nestorian Christianity was widespread for a considerably longer time. The rule of the Kār Khatāy [q.v.] followed that of the Karšu in 535/1141. Thus there was a renewed influence of Chinese cultural elements (Nephrith, Sung porcelain) in the area, and these mixed again with those of Transoxania (Bernstamm, 168, 171 f.). Meanwhile, the numerous wars of the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries resulted in a decrease of the population of the Ču valley. Where the Chinese traveler Čauq Čun still met several towns and villages in 616/1219, and crossed the Ču by a wooden bridge (E. Bretschneider, Med. Researches, i, London 1888, 51, 519 f.; A. Waley, The Travels of an Alchemist, London 1931, many ruins are reported already in 658/1259. At that time (651/1253), the region formed the border line between the areas of influence of the two Mongol Khāns Batu [q.v.] and Mongke (Magū [q.v.]). Shāhan (Shavāyān), the founder of the "Blue" (White) Horde (see 9ave-pōths) had his winter quarters here. But the main cause of virtual de-population of the area, was war amongst the Mongols in the 8th/14th century (see Čaghatāy), plague (according to epigraphs of 739/1339), and the campaigns of Timūr [q.v.]. Our sources for these last already fail to mention any place-names in the Ču valley. The Nestorian settlements near Pīshpek and Tokmāk [q.v.], of which we have epigraphs of the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, also seem to have perished at this time. Muhammad Ḥaydar Dughštāl, Tārīkh Kāshgāri, ed. N. Elias and E. D. Ross, London 1895-98, 364 f., ca. 1546, mentions only ruins with a minaret rising above them. The modern name Burana for a tower in the ancient Tokmāk also derives from Manāra (according to Perovskiy in the Zap. Vost. Old., viii, 352).

Later the Ču valley occasioned some difficulty under the Kalmuks and the (Kara-) Kirghiz. Then it came under the rule of the Khāns of Khokand, who founded the fortresses of Pīshpek (in the Khokand historians' writings: Pīshkēk) and Tokmāk on the Ču. These came into Russian hands in 1860. Since then the Ču valley has belonged to Russia, and has become a target of eastern Slav settlement (cf. Herrmann, Atlas, 66-67). The upper course is in the Kirgiz S.S.R., the middle and lower reaches in the Kazak S.S.R. Since 1932, a great agricultural combine (hemp and other fibre plants) has developed in the area of the middle Ču. Two arms of the "Great Ču Canal" have been under construction since 1941; these should irrigate a further area. The Turkish railway crosses the river near the station of Ču, thus opening it up to traffic.

Historical Maps of the region of the Ču: A. Herrmann, Atlas of China, 1925, 37 and 60 in particular; Hudūd al-Ālam, 279, 299; Bernstamm, maps ii and iii (at the end). Islamic Maps: C. Müller, Mapae Arabiae, iv 78/8, 86*-91*.

Bibliography: E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kius (Turcs) Occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, 79, 85; Hudūd al-Ālam, index; W. Barthold, Zwölf Vorlesungen, Berlin 1935, index; idem, Four Studies, Leiden 1956, index s.v. Archaeology; A. N. Bernstamm (Bernstham), Istorioko-arkhologische otdern Tsentral'nogo T'yan Shan'yia i Pamiro Al'yaya, Moscow-Leningrad 1952 (passim; compare above and index under Ču and Čuyskaya dolina) (Material i issledovania po archeologii SSSR 26).


(Math. Spuler)

COBĀNIDS (COBĀNIDS), a family of Mongol amirs claiming descent from a certain Sūrghān
in Mewlewî Derwîsh circles. It is also used as a term of respect for various wonder-working holy men in Istanbul and Anatolia, as reported by Ewliya Çelebi (cf. Ewliya Efendi, Travels, translated by Hammer, i, 2, 21, 25; ii, 97, 213).

With this meaning, Dede has also entered the Persian language (dada, plur. daddagân) (compare F. Steingass, Persian-English Dictionary, London 1830, s.v.). In the terminology of the Şafawid taṣâba, dada denoted one of the small group of officers in constant attendance on the murşid (cf. Tadhkira al-Mulâh, 125, n. 4).

**Bibliography:** other than the works already mentioned in the article: J. T.Zenker, Türkisch-Arabisch-Persisches Handwörterbuch, Leipzig 1866, s.v. 1; Hüsûyî Kâdi, Türk lugat, Istanbul 1938; Şeyh Süleyman Buhârî, Lâgûät-ṣagâyû ve türkî osmund, Istanbul 1948; Ahû Hayyân, Kitâb al-sîrâkh li-lisân al-Atrak, ed. A. Çelebioglu; I, iii, 506 (Mecûd Mansûrûglû).

(Fr. Taeuschner)

**DEDE AGHÂ, now Alexandria, town on the Aegean coast of Thrace, founded in 871, after the construction of the branch railway from the main Rumeli line. Being an outlet for the products of the hinterland it prospered rapidly, so that in 1300/1883 it supplanted Dimetocha as the centre of a sandjak (mutasarrîfiyya) of the vilâyêt of Edirne. In 1894 the sandjak of Dede Aghâ comprised the kadaş of Dede Aghâ, Enez (İnos) and Sozrûtu; the kadaş of Dede Aghâ comprised three nûbiyes, Perejîk, Megri and Semadrek, and 41 villages. This was the position until the region was lost as a result of the Balkan War of 1912-3. Two mosques were built in the town, one in the Muşlîm al-Din quarter in 1877, the other, in the Arab style, in the Hamidiyye quarter in 1890, in the court-yard of which the mutasarrîf Trabzonlu Hüseyin Rûşhî Pasha is buried. In 1894 there were some 1500 houses in Dede Aghâ. In the village of Fere-Ildjaçlar there were foundations of Gâzî Evrenos Beg [q.v.] and of (Kodja) Dâvûd Pasha [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** Edirne Sâhinâması for 1370 and 1317; 'Ali Dîwâd, Memâliḳ-i ʿOğlumâçıyanın taʾrikh ve âşıkârîyya luğâtl, Istanbul 1913; Ebubekir Böredî, Nâ'îbünâyet-i Belde-i Edirne, iii (Beyazid Library, Istanbul). (M. Taviy Gökcüllî)

**DEDE KORKUT, a Turkish collection of twelve tales in prose, interspersed with verse passages, the oldest surviving specimen of the Oghuz epic and one of the most remarkable monuments of the Turkish language. They are named after the sage, a legendary character, who appears in each tale; he is the poet-singer who re-composes and recites each narrative, and bestows his blessings upon all. He is strongly reminiscent of the poet-singers of the shamanistic era. The only existing complete manuscript is in Dresden (H. O. Fleischer, Catalogus codicum man. orientalium ... no. 86) of which J. H. von Diez made a copy for the Berlin Library (A. Pertsch, Die Hand, Zeicheninschriften ... vi, no. 203). The works of von Diez (Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien, i, Berlin-Halle 1815, 359-437) and W. Barthold (Zapiski Vostochnogo Otdeleniya, Imp. Russ. Arkh. Obščestva, viii, 1894, 203-218; also ix, 1855; xi, 1882; xii, 1899; xv, 1904; xix, 1910) and the first edition of the book by Kiliçli Muallim Rifâ'î (Kitâb-i Dede Korkut 'âlî lisan-i tâ'ziyet Oğuzân, Istanbul, 1322/1916) are based on the Berlin copy. The first edition in transcription with a long historical-bibliographical introduction by Orhan Şâk Gökây (see bibliography) also uses the Berlin copy with some emendations from the Dresden copy.

In 1950 Ettore Rossi discovered a second incomplete manuscript in the Vatican Library (Un nuovo manoscritto del "Kitâb-i Dede Gorût") in RSO, xxv (1950), 34-43, which he published in facsimile with an Italian translation of the whole work and a 95-page introductory study. In 1958 Muharrem Ergin published a new transcription of the whole text with the facsimiles of both the original manuscripts and an introduction. A promised second volume will contain an index, grammar and notes. The work also aroused interest in Ağharbaydjan (for a criticism, on ideological grounds, see Öst-Probleme, iii, no. 35, 1951). An edition of the text appeared in Baku in 1939, and a Russian translation, based on a manuscript left by Barthold, in 1950.

The publication of the complete text in 1916 gave great impetus to Dede Korkut studies, and since then a growing number of scholars have been occupied with elucidating many historical, literary, linguistic, ethnological and folkloristic problems of the work. Despite the remarkable contributions of the above-mentioned authors and other scholars (among them M. F. Köprüülü, A. İnan, P. N. Boratav, Hamid Arasli, Walter Ruben, Faruk Sümer, M. F. Kirzioğlu, etc.) these problems continue to be controversial and there is still disagreement as to the date, authorship, the origin of the existing text, the identity of the heroes and of the place-names, etc. As research stands at present, we can cautiously assume that these stories were collected from oral tradition and put together and polished by an unknown author, probably during the second half of the 9th/10th century. They seem to be mainly based on the reminiscences of the Oghuz Turks concerning their life in their original home in Central Asia. In the present text they relate the life of the Oghuz Turkish tribes in north-eastern Anatolia, the deeds of their prince Bayundur Khan and their chief Salur Kazan Beg, of his wife Burla Khâtun, and his son Uzur and their companions, their battles against other Turkish tribes and against the Black Sea Greeks and Georgians. The effect of Islamic culture is superficial. The Islamic elements all have common characteristics, in expression, style and content, with Anatolian and Central Asian popular literature. Some of the tales (e.g., Beyrek) still live in Turkish folklore in slightly altered versions, and two tales (Depęgöös and Deli Drumrul) show striking resemblances to Greek legends (Cyclops and Admetus) (cf. C. S. Mundy, Polyphemus and Tegea, BSOAS, xviii, 1956, 279-302).

**Bibliography:** Detailed bibliographical data are given in the following works: Orhan Şâk Gökây, Dede Korkut, Istanbul 1935; Ettore Rossi, II Kitab-ı Dede Gorut, Vatican 1957; P. N. Boratav, Korkut Atlâ, in İA; idem, Dede Korkut hikâyelerindaki tarih olayları ve kitabın tarih tarihi, TM, xii, 1938, 30-62; Muharrem Ergin, Dede Korkut Kitabi, i, Göriş-Mein-Facsimile, Ankara 1958. For a recent study of the language of the work see E. M. Demirciçade, Kitab-i Dede Korkut dastanlarının dili, Baku 1959. A German translation of the text was published by J. Hein, Das Buch des Dede Korkut, Zurich 1958.

(Fahrî İz)

**DEDE SÜLTÂN, epiphon of a great religious fanatic by name of Bürkûlû Mustâfa, who was prominent in Anatolia in the time of Mehmed I (further information under Bârî al-dîn b. Kâri Samâwîn).**

(Fr. Taeuschner)

**DEFTER** [see DAPTAR].

**DEFTER-I KHAĞÂNI** [see DAPTAR-I KHAĞÂNI].
generally larger than the other types such as the duff, mashar and far, although in the Kasakh al-humum we read that tambourines were made in various sizes 'from the large far (far habir) to thesmall ghribb (ghribb dahabi)'. For the Egyptian instrument see Villoteau (988), and for the Algerian see Christianowitsch (31, pl. 9), Delphín et Guin (37) and Lavinvac (2931). In Morocco, according to Höst (261, pl. xxxi, 6), it was called the dîf (ذِيف). Actual specimens may be found at Brussel, Nrs. 308, 309 (Mahlion, ii, 393, 400) and at New York, Nrs. 452 (Catalogue, ii, 50).

4. The round form with jingling plates. This is similar to No. 2 but with the addition of several pairs of jingling plates (sunâdî) fixed in openings in the shell or body of the instrument. This is the far. Although the author of the Kasakh al-humûm makes the name older than that of the duff, yet we have no substantial proof of this. We find the far in the Yemen in the 6th/12th century (Kay, Yaman, 54) and in the 7th/13th century Vocabulis in Arabico it is given as farr (= tinânum). The Persian instrument is depicted by Kaempfer under the name of daf (741, fig. 7) and Niebuhr shows an Arabian example which he calls the daff (i, pl. 26). Höst (261, pl. xxxii) gives a design of a Moroccan instrument in the 12th/18th century under tir (تجار). In Algeria it is called the tar (Delphín et Guin, 42; cf. Taghhrat al-nisîyân, 93; Lavinvac, 2844), and a design is given by Christianowitsch (pl. 10). The Egyptian far is described and delineated by Villoteau (i, 988) and Lane (chap. xviii), whilst actual examples may be seen at Brussels, Nrs. 312-5 (Mahlion, i, 394-5) and New York, Nrs. 455, 1319, 1359 (Catalogue, iii, 51). In Egypt the smaller types were given the name of rikb (Villoteau, i, 989), by no means a modern name (Kasakh al-humûm, fol. 193). There are examples at Brussels, Nrs. 316, 317 (Mahlion, i, 395).

5. The round form with jingling rings. This is a similar instrument to the preceding but with jingling rings (djallâghî) fixed in the shell or body instead of jingling plates. In Egypt, in the time of Villoteau (i, 988), it was known as the mashar, but in Persia, a century earlier, Kaempfer calls it the dâ’irâ (741, 4).

6. The round form with small bells. This is the same instrument as the preceding in regard to shape but the jingling apparatus, instead of being fixed in spaces in the shell or body, is attached to the inside of the shell or body. These small bells (âfîrids), often globular in shape like sonnettes, are sometimes attached to a metal or wooden rod fixed across the inside of the head. This instrument is popular in Persia and Central Asia where it is generally known as the dâ’irâ. An 11th/17th century instrument is shown by Kaempfer (742, r). For a modern instrument see Lavignac (3076). Apparently dâ’irâ and duff became generic names for all types of the tambourine although the former must have been reserved for a round type.

7. The round form with both snares and jingling implements. In the Maghribi this instrument is called the jâghîsk (Delphín and Guin, 1928, 1929). In some parts, however, this type is called the fahîla. In Egypt, according to Villoteau, it was the bandâyra.

If the drum (tabl) sounds the martial note of Islam, as Doughty once said, the tambourine sounds the social note. It is true that in the gâhîliyya the tambourine was in the hands of the matrons and singing-girls (bâyânas) during the battle, sometimes in company with the reed-pipe (mismâr) as with the Jewish tribes (dârfûn, iii, 172), but it was also the one outstanding instrument of social life (al-Suyûtî, Muzhir, ii, 236) as many a kudâr testifies. In artistic music the tambourine has ever been the most important instrument for maintaining the rhythm (îbhâdât, usûl, durâb). The duff became the Persian daff or dap, the Kurdish dafîk, the Albanian and Bosnian def, and the Spanish and Portuguese adefa. The dâ’ira is the Caucasian dahare, the Serbien and Albanian daira, and the dâ’ara of India. The far survives in the Polish tur and the Swahlî alâri. The tambourine was popularized in Europe by the Moors of Spain and was, for a long time, known as the tambour de Basque, the latter region being one of the gateways for the infiltration of Moorish civilization. It fell into desuetude in Europe about the 15th century but was revived again in the 17th century when Europe adopted it as part of the Turkish or Janissary music craze.


(D. G. FARMER)

DÜGLÂT, occasionally DÜGLAT, a Mongol tribe whose name, according to Abu ‘l-Ghâzî (ed. Desmaisons, St. Petersburg 1871, i, 65), derives from the plural of the Mongol word dogholong (-lang) "lame". The tribe appears to have played no part in the early period of the Mongol Empire, though it is supposed always to have supported Čingiz Khân (Rašîd al-Dîn, ed. Berezin in Truul sost. old. Imp. Russk. Arkhöol. obshcöstva, vii, 275, xiii[text 47, 52; tr. L. A. Khetagurov, Moscow-Leningrad 1925, ii, 193]). At that time the tribe apparently emigrated in its entirety out of Mongolia; there is at least no Mongol tribe of that name today.

The Düglât did not attain political significance until after the disintegration of the Ulghân Empire (q.v.), from which time Muhammad Haydâr Dûglât (Haydar Mirzâ, q.v.), a member of the tribe, provides information about them in his Ta’rikh-i
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Ahmad Mirza against Abû Bakr Mirza (see above). His sons Muhammad Ḥusain and Sayyid Muhammad Mirza vacillated continuously between the two dynasties and were even from time to time in the service of the Uzbeks. The former was finally killed in 1510 at the command of Ṣahyābīnī (q.v.) in 914/1508-9. His brother fell victim in 1533 to the hatred of Khān ʿAbd al-Kāshī of Mogholistan, who had come to power in the same year (Taʾrīkh-i Raghibī 106 ff., 305, 450). Muhammad Ḥusain’s son, the historian Muhammad Ḥaydar Mirza, left in 1541 his position as governor of Ladakh in the service of the ruler of the Tarim Basin to proclaim his independence in Kāshān (Mīrā Azm). With the elimination of this line and the end of Abû Bakr’s (see above) rule in 920/1514, the independence of the Dughlāt in the Tarim Basin came to an end. They continued to support the Čingizids there and wielded considerable power into the 17th century.

A tribute of the “Great Horde” of Kazakhs between the Ili and the Jaxartes bore the name Dulat into the 20th century, obviously derived from Dughlāt. At the end of the 19th century, they included almost 40,000 tents (see N. Aristov, Zametki ob dinastickom sostave Tyurkshkikh semei i narodnosty, St. Petersburg 1897, 77).

Bibliography: the sources are mentioned above. Studies include W. Barthold, Zuöl Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türkischen Mittelasiens, Berlin 1935, 209-224 (French tr. Paris 1945); idem, Four studies on the History of Central Asia, tr. V. Minorsky, i, 1956, 54; R. Grousset, L’Empire des steppes, Paris 1939, index; P. P. Ivanov, Ocherki po istorii Sredney Azii (Outlines of the History of Central Asia), Moscow 1958, i and ii; B. Spuler, in Handbuch der Orientalistik, volume v, 3, index. The last two works named contain further detailed bibliography.

(D. BARTHOLOMEW [B. SPULER])

DUGHĀT — DUKAYN AL-RĀDIJIZ

(D. BARTHOLOMEW [B. SPULER])

DUGHĀT (Ar.), “forenoon”, the hour of one of the prayers (see Salat).

DUKAYN AL-RĀDIJIZ, the name of two poets who were confused by Ibn Khtyaba (Ṣāḥīḥ, Shākir ed. 592-95) and the authors who copied or utilized him: Ibn ʿAbd al-Rabbī, Ibid. 1346/1928 ed., 202-5; Aḥbānī, viii, 155—Beirut ed., ix, 252-3; C. A. Nallino, Litt., with a note of correction by M. Nallino.

1. — Dukayn b. Radjaʾ al-Fusayml (d. 105/ 723-24): a panegyric in radjaz composed by him on Moḥsab b. al-Zubayr, and an sūfī upon his horse who won a race organized by al-Walid b. ʿAbd al-Malik (see Yāktū, xi, 113-17; Ibn ʿAsākir, v, 274-9), have been preserved.

2. — Dukayn b. Saʿīd al-Dārimī (d. 109/727-28) to whom Ibn Khtyaba actually dedicated his article entitled Dukayn al-Rādiż; see also Ibn ʿAsākir, ibid.; Yāktū, xi, 177-19. He wrote a panegyric on ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz when the latter was made governor of Medina (87/706), which brought him a rich present, formal promises and perhaps the intimacy of ʿUmar. After the latter had risen to the Caliphate (99/717), Dukayn went to visit him, reminded him of their covenant and received a new gift. This Dukayn is said to have written the line: “When a man has not sullied his honour with vile deeds, whatever garment he wears is fine”, which appears, however, at the beginning of the famous Lāmiyā by al-Samawʿal (F. Būstānī, al-Maqrūzī al-Kādīḡa, i, 345).

This poet should not be confused with Dukayn
(intact or reduced to a single hemistich); (b) in lexicography, the afreed are the words handed down by one lexicographer (see al-Suyutî, Muhîrî, i., ch. 5), distinct from ḍhâd (ibid., i, 114; lines 8-12) and masâfîrî (ibid., ch. 15); (c) in grammar, al-fard has been said to signify "the singular" by de Sacy (Gr. Ar.†, i., 149). Fleischer (Kleine Schriften, i., 97), Wright (Ar. Gr.†, i., 528). This can only be a recent or exceptional meaning of the word, which should be dropped and replaced by the traditional terms al-wâhid or (more often used today) al-nasîr; (d) in the science of hadîth, fard is synonymous with gharîb mutlak: a tradition in which the second link of the chain of those who have transmitted it is only represented by a single tâbi’î; (e) in astronomy, al-fard denotes the star alpha in Hydra (al-qâhâda), and hence the most brilliant (idea of isolation); (f) in arithmetic, al-adad al-fard is "the odd number" (from 3 upwards, inclusive), as opposed to al-adad al-sawdâ ‘even number’ (al-Khârizmi, Mafîsîth al-ulîm, ed. van Vloten, 184), other uses of fard in the divisibility of numbers, ibid., 184-5; (g) for theologians and philosophers, al-fard denotes the species, as restricted by the bond of individuation.

Bibliography: in the text; see also Tahânawi, Dictionary of technical terms, i., 1087, 1107, 1728 foot and 1775; Lane, Lexicon, s.v. (H. Fleischer)

AL-FARD [see NUDUM]

FARD (A.), also farîdâ, literally "something which has been apportioned, or made obligatory", and as a technical term, a religious duty or obligation, the omission of which will be punished and the performance of which will be rewarded. It is one of the so-called al-ahkâm al-khamsa, the "five qualifications" by which every act of man is qualified in religious law (see ANKÂM). A synonym is wâdîb. The Ḥanâfî school makes a distinction between fard and wâdîb, applying the first term to those religious duties which are explicitly mentioned in the proof texts (Kûr’ân and sunna) as such, or based on tâijâda, and the second to those the obligatory character of which has been deduced by reasoning. This distinction is not made by the other schools, and as a norm for action fard and wâdîb are equally binding. Islamic law distinguishes the individual duty (fard ‘ayn), such as ritual prayer, fasting, etc., and the collective duty (fard kifaya), the fulfilment of which by a sufficient number of individuals excuses the other individuals from fulfilling it, such as funeral prayer, holy war, etc.

Bibliography: Tahânawi, Dictionary of technical terms, 1124-6, 1444-8; N. P. Aghnides, Mohammedi theories of finance, New York 1916, 112 ff.; Santillana, Istituzioni, i., 57 ff. See also FURDA. (TH. W. JUVENBOLL*)

FARGHÂNA, Fergâna, a valley on the middle Jaxartes (Sir-Daryâ), approximately 300 km. long and 70 km. wide, surrounded by parts of the Tian-shan mountains: the Çatkal range (Ar. Dindghal, up to 3,000 m. high) on the north, the Fergâna mountains (up to 4,000 m.) on the east, and the Alai mountains (up to 6,000 m.) on the south. The only approach (7 km. wide) accessible in all seasons is in the west, at the point where the Jaxartes leaves the valley and where the trade-route (and since 1899 the railway from Samarqand to Osh) enters it. The Farghâna valley covers approximately 25,000 km.; the irrigated land (9,000 km.) has increased during the last decades, owing to the constant extension of irrigation. The interior of the area consists of a desert.

The Farghâna valley has always been fairly densely populated since the earliest irrigation of Islam, and even in pre-Islamic times, according to Chinese sources. As a consequence, the indigenous population has been able to withstand the Turks, who have pressed in repeatedly ever since early Islamic times; thus the Turks have only settled in one part of the district (cf. the present political distribution below). Since the end of the nineteenth century the Russians have also settled almost exclusively in the towns, leaving the agricultural areas in the hands of the indigenous population.

Evidently Farghâna became known to the Chinese in 128 B.C., from the description of an envoy who had travelled through it. But the connexion of the Chinese accounts with individual areas or persons cannot be established with any certainty. After the spread of the second (western) Kûk-Turkish kingdom, Farghânâ was exposed to Turkish attacks and, after continued fighting between 627 and 649 A.D., came under Turkish dominion. A Turkish prince took up residence in Kâsân (Chinese K’o-sâl), the capital of that time. After the overthrow of the first west-Turkish kingdom by the Chinese, in 657, the whole district was governed from Kâsân by a Chinese governor. The indigenous Iranian dynasty, whose influence had for some time been weakened by a succession of local princes (as reported by the Chinese envoy Hûan-tsang in 630), was evidently supplanted by a Turkish ruling family, after the elimination of Chinese rule in about 650. In 739 Arslân Khân is mentioned as ruler of Farghânâ.

An Arab-Muslim advanced into Farghânâ, alleged to have taken place in the time of the Caliph Abû ’l-Wâli’î under the leadership of Muhammad b. Dîjir, who is said to have fallen at Sâid Bûlân at the head of 2700 warriors (according to Dîjâmî Khârîp apud Barthold, Turkestan, 160), certainly belongs to the realm of legend. The legend formed the basis for a Persian folk-tale (said to have been translated from Arabic) which later spread throughout Central Asia, and was finally translated into Turkish (cf. Protokoll Turkest. Kružka Lysbiâleti Arkeologiî, iv., 149 f.).

In fact the Muslim invasion of Farghânâ is connected with the occupation of Transoxania by Kûtaybî b. Muslim (q.v.). He first advanced into the country in 942-2-3 and attempted a revolt from there against the Caliph in 967-15, but was killed by his own soldiers (Tabâri, ii., 1256 l., 1275-3; S. G. Kilyasjînî, Istîsîrî bû’în naqow Sîrîdîn Asîi protiv arabov [Remarks on the history of the struggle of the peoples of Central Asia against the Arabs], in Epigráfika Vostoka, ix (1954), 55-64: this treats mainly of the events of 712]. Kutayba’s grave is still pointed out today close to the village of Djâlî Kuduk, near the battles which followed in Persia in the next decades, finally leading to the downfall of the Umayyads in 749-50, prevented for some time the consolidation of Arab-Islamic rule over Farghânâ. The Muslims apparently had to leave the country again and in 1032-3 the indigenous Sogdian prince was able to recall and resettle in part of his country those Sogdians who had migrated further eastwards to avoid the summons to adopt Islam (Spuler, Iran, 37, 544 f.). At that time the local nobility, the Djâdks (cf. 4.3) played the leading rôles in Farghânâ, as in the rest of Transoxania. The local prince also bore this title beside of that of Ikhshîd (cf. Ishqulbîns, and OPgA l. Smirnov, Sogdiyekha moneli khovyly istočnik diya istoriî Sredney Asii [Sogdian coins as a
new source for the history of Central Asia), in Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie, vi (1949), 356-67; further, A. Yu Yakubovsky [ed.]: *Trud tselisheko-tadzhikskovo ekspeditsii. . . . [Works of the Sogdian-Tadjik expedition . . . ]*, i, Moscow-Leningrad 1950, 224-51; further its sources: al-Baladhuri, Futuḥ, 420; al-Ṭabarî, ii, 1424, 2142; Hudâd al-Silam, ed. Minorsky, 115-17, 335; idem in *BSOS*, xvii/a (1955), 265.—In the year 1212/39 the Arabs were once more able to send a governor to Farghânâ (al-Ṭabarî, ii, 1694), but there was still a continued opposition to Islam, especially as the permanence of Arab rule had again been put in doubt by the advance of the Chinese armies into Western Central Asia as far as Transoxania, between 745 and 758 (cf. Spuler, Iran, 302, and the sources and studies given there). An envoy sent to the Caliph al-Mahdî by the local prince, who had evidently fled to Kâshghar, was held prisoner for a long time owing to his refusal to adopt Islam (Ya’qûbî, ii, 645). The Caliph al-Mahdî, Hârûn al-Rashîd (175-679/1) and al-Maʿmûn were also forced to send troops to Farghânâ to overcome the opposition to Islam and Arab rule (Ya’qûbî, ii, 465 f., 478; Gardêzî, 19; further Spuler, Iran, 51 f.). Only the inclusion of Farghânâ in the dominions of the Sâmânis [q.v.] in approximately 805/820-1, under the administration of the governor Nûb b. Asad (d. 247/861-2), opened the last doors to Islam, both in Kâshân (al-Ya’qûbî, Geogr., 294, al-Ya’qûbî, ii, 478; al-Ṭabarî, ii, 1257), the centre of administration, and Qâshân. The indigenous dynasty had in the meantime disappeared. From then on, the inhabitants of Farghânâ supplied soldiers for the guards of the Caliph al-Muṭâṣim (218-27/833-42: al-Baladhuri, 437; Spuler, Iran, 137, 185, fn. 8). They thereby strengthened the influence of the Iranian element in Mesopotamia, which moreover increased continually under the Sâmânis.

Farghânâ in the time of the Sâmânis has been amply described by Arab geographers. At that time a change in the economic importance of the several parts of the country appears to have taken place. According to Ibn Khurraḍâ dibhî, 30, the road leading into the country from the west crossed the Jaxartes at Khodjand [q.e.] now Leninâbâd, and continued to Akhsikâkh [q.e.], along the right bank, then to Kûbâ, ʿOgh and ʿOzkân (Dzgand) along the left bank. Al-Iṣṭâkhris, 335, on the other hand considers the road running south of the river to be the main one and lists several populated places along it; only a secondary road led to Akhsikâth at that time. The Farghânâ valley then formed the frontier district against the (still unconverted) Turks, who had recently been driven back north-eastwards in several places. There were strong garrisons in ʿOgh and some neighbouring forts, used as observation posts against them. Akhsikâth (al-Iṣṭâkhris, 333) was the capital at that time, a position it held as early as the middle of the seventh century, according to Chinese reports and al-Baladhuri (Futuḥ, ed. de Goeje, 420). On the other hand Kûbâ is designated as larger, and as the actual capital of the country by al-Muṣaddasî, 277, though its period of prosperity was certainly short.—In the twelfth century Farghânâ was divided into three provinces and many administrative districts, which are listed by the geographers. They stress the fact that the villages of the country were bigger than elsewhere in Transoxania and occasionally extended as much as a day’s journey. Islam (of the Ḥanâfi school of law) had asserted itself successfully in the meantime, and convents (Khânâbâh) of the Karrâmîyya [q.e.] are also mentioned by al-Muṣaddasî, 323. Nothing else is reported about adherents of other religions, such as Christians, Manichaens and Zoroastrians. Nevertheless an Arabic inscription dating from 433/1043-2 was discovered in the gorge at Wârûkî (in the south), showing a Sassanian and Christian (rûmî) date beside the Muslim one (Protokoll, viii, 46 f.). A further Arabic inscription (without this peculiarity in the dating) from the year 329/940-1 was found in ʿOgh in 1885 (Ott's Imp. Archêg. Kommiss. ii 1882-1888, 461 f.)

Judging by the growth in revenue the country’s prosperity increased greatly in Sâmâni times. According to Ibn Khurraḍâ dibhî, 38, it amounted to 280,000 dirhems; Ibn Ḥawkâl, 470, writing about 130 years later, in 977, puts it already at one million (Spuler, Iran, 476).

After the collapse of the Sâmâni state in 385/999, Farghânâ came under the dominion of the Kârulks [q.e.] and thus of the ruling dynasty of the Ilâ-Ḵâns or Kârâkâns [q.e.], ʿOzkân [q.e.], where twelfth-century buildings and tomb-stones are still preserved, now became the centre of administration. It was there that most coins were minted (often bearing the province name Farghânâ as the place of coinage), but other minting-places also occurred. The whole of Farghânâ was originally administered from ʿOzkân. After the divisions which soon took place within the Kârâkânî dynasty (cf. O. Pritsak, in *Isl.*, xxxi/1 (1953), 17-68), the princes of Farghânâ settled in ʿOzkân, where they withstood a Sâljuḵi advance in the years 480-485/988-993. In 484/994 Farghânâ came under the dominion of the Gûrûḵâns [q.e.] of the Kârâkâtî [q.e.], but the indigenous dynasty was still tolerated, as elsewhere within this state. Until 560/1165-79, this dynasty seems also to have ruled over ʿOzarḵand, which later again came under the rule of a separate branch of the Kârâkâns. From 1212 to 1218 Farghânâ was disputed between the Khûrâzmshâh Muḥammad II [q.e.] and first the Nayan prince Küdûg, who had fled westwards, then the Mongols; with the subjection of the prince of Akhsikâth and ʿOzkân the province subsequently fell to the Mongols (Ulûs of ʿOghatây; cf. the article ʿOghatây, above) for whom it was long administered by Muḥammad and his son Masʿûd Yâlahâv in the thirteenth century. Local princes in Farghânâ were tolerated for a long time; the sheltered position of the valley induced Barâk Khân, the Mongol governor, and the Kârâkâtîs to shelter him, to keep the treasury there (Waše, Bombay ed., 67 bottom; Djuwâynî, 1, 148).

The newly founded town of Anduruku [q.e.] (known to the Arab geographers only as the village Andurûkân) was the capital of the Farghânâ valley at the end of the thirteenth century. Marghânân now also gained in importance.

After the Ulus of ʿOghatây split into two opposing sections in the fourteenth century, both the western kingdom (Transoxania) and the eastern kingdom (then called Mugholstân) contended for Farghânâ.
at different times, up to the time of Timur. As Farghānā belonged to Mogholistan during the greater part of this struggle, its administration shared certain aspects of the administration of the Tarim valley: the tax districts in both countries were called Ūrēn, not Tūmān (Mongolian ūmēn: unit of ten thousand) as in the rest of Transoxania.

Under the Timūrids (q.v.), Farghānā mostly belonged to Khorasān (i.e., to the dominion of Shāhrukh (q.v.) and his son Ulugh Beg (q.v.)) and from 823-991 (1419-94) had its own ruler in 'Umar Shāyiḳ (q.v., a great-grandson of Timūr. He was succeeded by his son Bābur, who from Farghānā moved against the intruding Shāybanids (q.v.) and advanced as far as Samarqand; but in 909/1504, after eventful battles he saw himself forced to surrender Farghānā, and finally fled altogether to India (for details see BĀBUR). It is to him that we owe a more exact description of Farghānā at a time when power-relationships in Central Asia were undergoing a decisive change, through the fall of the Timūrids, the advance of the Shāybanids at the head of the Ōzbegs (q.v.), as well as the establishment of the Šafā'ī Šāfavis (q.v.) in Persia. At that time there were larger towns in Farghānā, to which Bābur also adds Khodjānd. Khokand, the later capital, was only a village at the time. The capital was Andijān, which was already completely turkicized. (According to Bābur, it was here that Čağhatay, raised to a literary language by ʻAlī Šir Nāwī, was spoken). Marghānān was then still Iranian. At the time of Bābur there were numerous orchards and gardens in Farghānā and various kinds of wood used for making quivers, bird-cages and similar articles; also a reddish-white stone, discovered in about 1492 and used for making knife-handles and articles of that kind. Iron and turquoise were obtained from the mines; but Bābur makes no mention of coal-mining or the manufacture of weapons, two formerly important branches of the economy. According to his estimate the country was only sufficiently rich to support an army of 3,000 men.

After the final expulsion of the Timūrids, Farghānā belonged to the Ōzbeg state of the Shāybanids; Andijān was then the seat of a local dynasty and gave its name to the whole valley (cf. Maḥmūd ibn Wali, Bahar al-asrār, MS India Office 575, fol. 102b). After the collapse of the Shāybanid state in 1598-9, several Khodjā families divided the country up among themselves. They lived under the nominal dependency of Bukhārā, in Čadak, north of the Jaxartes, and had to submit to a number of arrangements with the Karakhs and Kirgiz, who repeatedly pressed into the valleys of the mountains surrounding Farghānā. In 1222/1709-10 the Farghānā valley became a separate Özbek Khānate under Shāhrukh Bl (Mūllā Niyaż Muhammad, Taʾrīk-i Shāhrukhī, ed. N. N. Fantusov, Kazan 1885, 21; cf. Ivanov, 178-214). From then until the 18th century the Farghānā valley was the centre of the Khānate of Khokand (q.v. for details about the name and history of the town). In 1876 the Khānate was annexed by the Russians and the centre of the "Farghānā district" (Ferganskaya Oblast), an area of 160,141 km² (according to Brockhaus-Efron) with 1,560,411 inhabitants (in 1897). The seat of the military government was the town New Marga, founded by the Russians, called Skobelev from 1907-24, and subsequently Farghānā (pop. 1951, approx. 50,000) and still today the centre of administration of the "Farghānā district" in Uzbekistan (8029 km² with approximately 720,000 inhabitants in [1951]). The towns of Khokand and Namangan were, however, considerably larger and of greater economic importance (Khokand had approximately 113,000 inhabitants in 1912, and Namangan 70,000; in 1931, in contrast, approximately 93,000 and 115,000 respectively).

The Russians forthwith raised Farghānā's cotton-production considerably, introduced new American kinds of cotton and made Farghānā (as Central Asia generally) one of their main providers of cotton and silk. The most important source of uranium of the Soviet Union is also situated in the Farghānā valley (especially near Tuya-Muyun); petroleum and coal are also extracted. — The ancient system of irrigation has been expanded and improved and, as the "Farghānā system", it has gained significance for the entire irrigation economy of the USSR: construction of the great Farghānā canal in 1939; Farhat dam on the Jaxartes. — The sudden economic advance caused an inflation which led to a revolt in 1898. From 1916 to 1922 Farghānā was involved in the fighting between the indigenous Turkish Basmak associations and the Russians, and later the Bolsheviks. After the October revolution the Farghānā zone was no longer a single administrative unit. Instead the central and eastern areas—essentially according to the nature of the majority of the population—were handed over to the Uzbekistan republic, and the west to Tadzikistan. The mountains surrounding the Farghānā valley belong for the most part, however, to Kirgizistan: this division demonstrates the result of the gradual advance of Turkish tribes into this area and, since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, into the mountains, as well as the retreat of the Iranians. This political organization has had no significance for the development of the valley's economy or system of communication. The knowledge of Russian has increased greatly in the last decades among the indigenous population, but without supplanting the indigenous languages.


Map: 1/8th cent.: A. Herrmann, Atlas of China, Cambridge Mass. 1935, 37; 1/10th cent.: Sporer, op. cit., end; modern: Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Ents-
He went to Egypt where his son, it seems, was born, and he and his family remained there. He wrote a continuation of al-Tabari's historical work, entitled al-Sila or al-Madhayyal, and his son wrote a further continuation, entitled Ši‘lat al-Sila. Both works are known only from quotations in the works of other historians, though it has been body of a papyrus leaf containing the account of a battle from the reign of al-Mu’tadid may derive from the Ši‘la; they were probably much more widely used than citations under their names indicate. The younger Farghani also wrote biographies of Kafir al-Iṣḥāḍī and the Fātimid al-‘Azl, both of which, unfortunately, have been lost along with most of the historical literature written under the Fātimids.

**Bibliography:** Ta‘rīkh Baḥdādī, ix, 389; Ta‘rīkh Dimaġhī, vi, 277; Yākūt, Uddabā`, ii, 161 f.; Šafādī, Wajfī, under Abūd (who follows Yākūt); intro. to Tabārī, xx; R. Guest, in A volume of Oriental studies presented to E. G. Brome, Cambridge 1922, 173; F. Rosenthal, A history of Musīm historiography, Leiden 1952, 73; N. Abbott, Studies in Arabic literary papyri, i, Chicago 1957, 190; (F. Rosenthal) FARHĀD PASHA [see FERHĀD PAŞA].

**FARHĀD WA-SHIRĪN.** A. Christensen (Sassanian), 469 and index) has collected together the information relating to Shirin (Pehlavi Širin "the sweet"; c. Γυκαρά, Glyceria), a Christian favourite of the Sassanid king of Iran, Khusraw II Parviz (Pehlavi Avakarīs "the victorious", 590-628). According to Sebeos, she was a native of Khuzistān; Khusraw married her at the beginning of his reign and she maintained her influence over him although inferior in status to Maria the Byzantine whom he had married mainly for reasons of policy; she protected the Christian clergy, probably lived for a time in the palace, the ruins of which still survive at Kaš-šīrīn [q.v.], and she did not forsake the king in the last hours immediately before his assassination; their son, Mardanšāh, was put to death when Šherōd, Maria’s son, overthrew him and ascended the throne. Legends concerning the love of the king and Širin soon came into being, and some of the details were collected by al-Tha‘alibī (691) and Firdawsi (Šah-nāma, trans. Mohl, viii), in particular Širin’s suicide over his romantic epistle together with that of Širin and Farhād (Pehlavi Farahād), became the subject of a series of romances in verse, in Persian, Turkish (see below) and Kurdish (Duda, 3, n. 7 and 8). Moreover Christensen (Gestes, 116-9) has noted certain features in the Persica of Cesia in which he sees elements which helped to form the legend of Farhād and Širin—Semiramis creating a garden near Mount Bagistan (Bīšūtûn), having a way cut through the Zagros mountains to allow for the passage of a canal, and having a royal castle built for her own use.

After the occupation of Iran by the Arabs, the first text in their language to mention Širin and her lovers is the Chronicle of al-Tabari; in its Persian translation by Bal'am, we read: "Širin was loved by Farhād whom Parviz punished by sending him to the quarries of Bīšūtûn" (trans. Zoteberg, ii, 304 and index, s.v. Ferhād, Širīn). The Arab geographers mention them; thus Yākūt claims to see Širin’s image among the sculptures of Takrī Bīšūtûn, according to poems which he quotes (Buldān, iii, 253-23) and records a narrative (iv, 112; and Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire de la Perse, 347-8 and 448-9) explaining how the king had a castle.
introd., 20. The important thing is that he gave new life to an original which otherwise would have disappeared like so many other Pahlavi texts. In his poem the influence of ancient Iran appears particularly in the frequent allusions to the divine or evil powers, to the sacred fires (mentioned by their names) and to their maintenance, to the ancient months and feast days, and to legendary features; there is in it a case of trial by ordeal, and one of those consanguineous marriages which were characteristic of the royal families of ancient Iran. The subject of the poem is fatal love: from the time of the appearance of the first edition of the Persian text the similarities between the poem and the story of Tristan and Isolde were recognized—there is thus no need to give an analysis of it here (cf. Massé, 9 ff.). The romance may be based on a historical fact: V. Minorsky has sought to demonstrate that it probably relates the adventures of a descendant of the Arscacid family and of a princess of one of the seven noble families of the Parthian period.

In Gurgâni’s poetry there are realistic features connected with folk and folklore. At times his style is affected and precious (tr., 20-1), especially when, like other Persian poets, he is describing feminine beauty in conventional terms (e.g., ch. 37; tr., 90). Mahdjûb has noted a series of images and of ancient proverbs (introd., 55-8), archaisms sometimes used with a special meaning (ibid., 34) and some words which are close to the Pahlavi forms (ibid., 43). The poem had a lasting influence. Mahdjûb points out similarities between some verses of Gurgâni and those of later poets, and even some borrowings (introd., 96 ff.). The ten passionate letters written by Wûs to Râmûn (Minovi, 347-85; Mahdjûb, 259-85) were imitated by the poets Awdâ, Jbn ‘Imâd, ‘Arîfî, ‘Imâd Fâkhî (ten letters), Amir Huasîny, Kâtîbî and Salmânî, Sâwîdî (thirty letters). Of more significance is the similarity evident in the plan of Nižâmî’s verse romance Khusrâw u Shîrîn, which was probably inspired by Gurgâni, though as regards style it may be suggested that Nižâmî intended that his learned and highly artificial style should form a contrast to the generally simple and sober style of Gurgâni.


(H. Massé)

GURGÂNI [see DURGÀN].

GÚRKHÁN, the title borne by the (non-Muslim) rulers of Karakhtîyâ [q.v.] (Chinese Hsi Liao = Western Liao) who governed central Asia between 522-51128-31 and 608/1212 (or, with Gûdûk, till 615/ 1218). The first ruler was Yeh-liu Ta-shih (d. 537/ 1143), a prince from the north Chinese dynasty of Liao, of the Kû-tân (Kháitìyâ) people. He overthrew the regime of the Karakhtîns [q.v.] or Ilîg-khâns and in 535/1145 defeated the Sâldjûkian sultan Sundân (q.v.) decisively in the Kâtîwân plain, north of Samar- kand; the victory of a non-Muslim ruler from the East over one of the most powerful rulers of Islam probably provided the foundation for the legend of Prester John [q.v.] (Gûrkhân > Johannes).

The title Gûrkhan is probably taken from the Turkish words kürgür (Mongol kûr) (“broad”, “wide”, “general”): cf. Mahmûd al-Askhârî, Diwân, ed. C. Brockelmann, Budapest 1928, 117; Radloff, Versuch eines Wörterbuches ..., 1960, ii, 1447, 1637; Mongol un Niuca Toboc’an (Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen), ed. E. Haenisch, Leipzig 1937, 65 and ed. Koziel, Moscow/Leningrad 1941, 278; P. Doerfer in OLZ, 1960, col. 635 f. The Muslims also refer to Gûrkhan as “Khân-i Kühân”.


(B. Spuler)

GUWÁKHarZ [see BâkâHarZ].

GÜZEL HÍSÁR [see âvâdÍ].

GUZGÀN [see guzeJàn].

GWÁLIYÀR, formerly capital of the Sindha state of Gwâliyâr, now a town in Madhya Pradesh. “Tradition assigns the foundation of the city to one Sûrâdî Sen who was cured of leprosy by an ascetic named Gwâlipa. The latter inhabited the hill on which the fort now stands, and this was called Gwâliyâr after him”. The early history of Gwâliyâr is, however, shrouded in myth and romance. The Hûna adventurers, Toraman and his son Mîhirkula, who partially overthrew the Gupta power in the 6th century A.D., are considered to be the first historical holders of the place. Later Ràdjâ Bhoj of Kanawdi, the Kaçhâwa Ràdjâpûts and the Parbârs respectively held sway over it.

In 143/1022 when Sultan Mahmûd of Ghazna marched against Ganda, the ruler of Kâlîngîr, he passed the fort of Gwâliyâr. Since the Ràdjâ of Gwâliyâr was a feudatory of Ganda, the Sultan stormed the fort. The Ràdjâ, despite his successful resistance, was so alarmed that he sued for peace (Zayn al-abhár, 79). In 592/1196 Kûbî al-Dîn Aybak took the fort from the Parbârs (Tâ’ht, Nâsirî, 145; Eng. tr., Raverty, i, 545-6, with note on other versions). Iletmîsh’s first territorial appointment was as the amir of Gwâliyâr (Tâbâkà-i Nâsîrî, 169; Eng. tr. i, 604). It appears to have been lost to the Turks because in 629/1231 Iletmîsh is reported to have reconquered it and made appointments of the amir-i dàd, the kowadî and the kâdî. But the history of the Muslim occupation of Gwâliyâr is a chequered one. Early in her reign Râdîyya (634-7/1236-40) had to send an expedition towards Gwâliyâr under Tumâr Khân, but the position became untenable and the fort had to be abandoned to Çahterdeva. In 649/1251 Balban led a full-scale expedition against Gwâliyâr, but does not seem to have achieved any permanent success, for the numismatic evidence shows that