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(W. Vychichl)

**KALMUK**, the Turkish name for a Mongol people, the Oyrat, who in the time of Chingiz Khan (q.v.) inhabited the forests to the west of Lake Baykal. The name is derived (probably only by popular etymology) from the verb kalmar, "to remain" and distinguishes the Oyrat, who "remained" pagans, from the Dungans (the Chinese-speaking Muslims), who had "returned" (the verb dönmek), according to the well-known Muslim idea, to Islam. A group of the Oyrat had accompanied Hulagu to the west and played a certain role in Il-Khanid Persia. The people as a whole, however, came into their own only after the collapse of the Mongol dynasty in China, when they wrested the greater part of Mongolia from the Chingizids and laid the foundations of the Kalmuk empire.

From the time of Ways Khan (1418-28) the Mongols on the Il (q.v.) had to fight against the "infidel Kalmak"; accounts of these wars are given in the *Tarikh-i Rashidi*. Ways Khan was twice taken prisoner by the Kalmuks and had to give his sister in marriage to their chief, Esen Tasyhi, the conqueror of the Il, the latter's father, was then ruling in Mongolia on the Chinese frontier, where he was succeeded in 1439 by Esen Tasyhi. After the death of Esen Tasyhi (1455) the great nomad empire of the Oyrat broke up; individual princes are mentioned from time to time later as ruling in the neighbourhood of Muslim lands; at the beginning of 1642/3 a Kalmuk embassy appeared in Harat. The Muslim sources also report the restoration of the Oyrat empire under Khara Khula (d. 1634). In Turkestan during this period also the Kalmuks were regarded as powerful foes of Islam. The Kazakh Khan Tawakkul (Tetkel in Russian) had to flee before them to Taşkent, where he was received by the Uzbek ruler Nawruz Ahmad (d. 953/1556); in reply to his appeal for help, Nawruz declared that even ten princes such as themselves would be no match for the Kalmuks. At a later date, however, on the occasion of his embassy to Tsar Fedor (1594), Tawakkul was described in Russian documents as "king of the Kazakhs and Kalmuks", perhaps because a few bands of Kalmuks had attached themselves to him. In the winter of 1609/10 there occurred the first incursion of the Kalmuks into Khazarizm. Soon after, under Tsar Vasili Shuisky (1606-1610), the Kalmuks entered into relations with the Russian government for the first time, though it was not until 1632 that they settled on the Volga on a large scale. This branch of the Kalmuks had separated from their kinsmen, under the leadership of Kho-Orloq, as early as 1618. The territory of the Volga Kalmuks did not therefore form part of the empire founded by Khara-Khula, although relations between the two branches of the people had not yet been severed. Representatives of the Volga Kalmuks still appeared at the *kuriyyat* (q.v.) of 1640; Batur, the son and successor of Khara-Khula, gave his daughter in marriage to the grandson of Kho-Orloq. By the same *kuriyyat* the dominance of Buddhism was firmly established among all branches of the Kalmuks. The progress made by Islam described in the *Tarikh-i Rashidi* (p. 91) in connexion with the above-mentioned marriage was apparently not maintained. Most of the Muslim territories in Turkestan were under the suzerainty of the Buddhist Kalmuk ruler on the Illi, the founder of the last great nomad empire in Central Asia, which lasted until it was destroyed by the Chinese in 1758; as late as 1749 the regent (ataik) of Bukhara and his opponent had to submit a dispute to the verdict of an embassy from the Kalmuk ruler. A great part of the Kazakhs' pasture land was now seized by the Kalmuks, and Islam was almost completely banished from the southern part of Semireye. Several Buddhist monuments, including Tibetan inscriptions, date from this period. It was only after the decline of the Kalmuk empire that these areas were re-occupied by the Muslim Kazakhs. The wars of the Volga Kalmuks with the Crimean Tatars and their raids into Khazarizm had less effect on Islam; from 1722 the Kalmuk chiefs on the lower course of the Volga were regarded simply as viceroyos (namestnik) of the Russian tsar. They had no longer any connexion with the ruler on the Illi. The decision of the "viceroy" Ubashi and a large number (about 300,000) of his people to migrate from Russia and settle in Chinese territory proved disastrous to the Volga Kalmuks. During the migration heavy losses were inflicted on them in Central Asia, especially by the Kazakhs (1771). Henceforth the Kalmuks were of no political significance in either Russia or in China. During the Muslim rising in the Crimea the great Kalmuk temple on the Volga near Kulji was destroyed.


(J. A. Boyle)

**The Modern Period.**

After 1771, some 50,000 Kalmuks continued to live west of the Volga. Their descendants joined the anti-Bolshevik Southeastern League but after its disintegration in 1920 they were formed into an "Autonomous Oblast" (province), which was raised to the status of Autonomous Republic in 1933. In 1939 the population of the republic was 200,000 including 134,000 Kalmuks. It was partly occupied by the Germans in 1942 and abolished by the Soviet Government in 1943, when all the Kalmuks were deported to Central Asia on the grounds of alleged collaboration with the enemy. A Soviet decree of 1957 provided for the return of the Kalmuks to their territory, which was reconstructed an Autonomous Republic in 1958 with its capital at Elista (formerly Stepnoy), 150 miles south of Volgograd. According to the 1970 census, the population was 268,000, of whom 110,000 were Kalmuks. This constitutes 80 % of the Kalmuks living in the USSR. A few thousand still live in the Sinkiang-Uygur Autonomous Region of China, where they are known as Oyrats. Only a small number of Kalmuks, less than 2,000 living in Semireye, have embraced Islam, the rest remaining actual or nominal adherents of Buddhism.


**KALPAK** [see LIBAS].
engaged the Sokoto 'ulama' in a famous correspon-
dence which seriously weakened their resolve to
continue ḍjjahid against Bornū, and he contained the
campaigns of Katagum and Hadžgilla by a great
expedition in 1826 which carried 'Jhidam far as Kano
before he was forced to withdraw. He secured the
eastern frontier south of Lake Chad by operations
against Bagarmi in 1821-4. In the first of these he
was assisted by the Ottoman ƙathim-mahām of the
Fazzân [q.v.], and he later maintained the Fazzânī
connection (of commercial importance to Bornū) by
alliance with the Awlad Sulaymān, who also helped
him strengthen his influence in Kānem as a buffer
against Wadā'ī.

As well as this, he radically reformed the structure
of government in Bornū, replacing the ancient and
ineffective feudal levies of the Mās by a new army of
Kānemī infantry and Shīwa Arab cavalry with a
manṣūr officer corps owing personal loyalty to him.
The old Kanūrī fid-holding offices remained in
existence, but fees were progressively transferred to
supporters of al-Kānemī, and a new council of
advisers dominated the government. These advisers,
mainly non-Kanūrī, represented a new and reforming
element in Bornūnian politics.

Al-Kānemī, though a scholar of considerable
standing, was not a prolific writer, only one short
work of āshīk, Nasbīh al-hukkām, and a poem, Nasīm
al-saṭār, being certainly attributable to him. A number
of his letters, however, are preserved.

Bibliography: Muhammad Bello, Inṣāh al-
masīr (1813), London 1950; Cairo 1960; D.
Denham and H. Catterton, Narrative of travels
and discoveries in North and Central Africa, London
1826; Y. Urvoy, Histoire de l'Empire du Bornou,
Paris 1949; L. Brenner, The Shekels of Kukara,

(Abdullāh Smith)

KANGWAR [see KINIKWAR.]

KANGHILL, ƙanhūl, the name of a Turkish
people living in mediaeval times in the steppes of
Turkistan and south-western Siberia. We do not
find mention of the Kanghill in the oldest Arab and
Persian geographical works of the 10th-11th
centuries, as we do of several other Turkish tribes.
For Mahmūd Kāshghārī, ƙanhūl was not an
ethnic designation, but was, as a proper noun, "the
name of a great man of the Kḻp̱čak", and as a
common noun, "a heavily-loaded cart" (Ḍīvwān
lughāt al-turk, tr. Atalay, i, 379). In some early
Turkish sources on the legendary origins of the
Turkish tribes, e.g., the Orduh-nāma, we find the
story that the tribe got its name from the man who
first constructed and used these heavy wagons for
transport across the steppes (see Marquart, Kommen, 163); but Sir Gerard Clauson thought it equally
likely that the wagon used by the Turks got its name
of ƙanhūl from this fact that it was introduced by
the Kanghill people to the steppe Turks, see his The
name Uýghur, in JRAI (1963), 147-8, and An etymologi-
cal dictionary of pre-eighteenth century Turkish, 638.

The Kanghill are most frequently mentioned in the
sources pertaining to the century or so preceding the
Mongol invasions of the 7th/13th century, and are
spoken of as part of the Kḻp̱čak confederation,
I.e., they belonged ethnically to the south-western
group of Turkish peoples. They are also associated
with the Kınım [q.v.], themselves apparently one of
the tribal groups eventually forming the Kḻp̱čak.
Concerning their habitat, Abu 'l-Qādir in his Shār-
djarā-ya Tarikhāna relates a legend that the Kanghill
had a ƙhūn, ƙon-Tonīf, whose centre was on the

Yayık or Ural River (Barthold, Four studies, ii. A
tistory of the Turkman people, 132), but by the
beginning of the 7th/13th century the central branch
of the Kḻp̱čak were also close neighbours of the Mongol
Nayman on the Irish (idean, TWelve Verses
über die Geschichte der Türkten Mitteleastien, 151, Fr
Histoire des tures d'Asie Centrale, 118). Minorsky
reads a passage in one of the manuscripts of Dīnār-
djânī's Ҭabākah-i nāsīrī, where there is mentioned a
punitive expedition into the steppes in 654/1256 by
the Khārazm-Shāh ƙalât al-Din Muhammad, as
noting to "Kādīr Khān Yughīr, ruler of the Kanghill
Tatars", whose lands stretched far north
into the region of perpetual twilight in summer (see
Ibnudāl-Dilām, 309). It seems that the Kanghill
nomadised over an extensive area of western Siberia,
but came as far south as the Sir Darya and northern
fringes of Transoxania, where Dīwāyūnī mentions
them several times in his story of the irruption of the
Mongols into Transoxania. Kanghill and Karług [q.v.]
had been amongst the rebellious troops of the Karā
Khānid ruler, and their unresponsiveness had led the
other potentate to call in the Karā Khīṭāya, with
disastrous results to his line (see karā khīṭāya).

At the time of the Mongols' appearance, the
Kanghill had a settlement called Karākūna on the
lower Sir Darya, not far from Dīwānī [q.v.], mentioned
as the place to which the Merkit fled after Cūricht
Khān had defeated them and the Nayman on the
Irish in 1208; it was also the place where in 657/1220
the Mongol general Cīn Temür rested before going on to occupy Dīnār (Barthold, Turkistan down
to the Mongol invasion, 361-2, 370, 415). Many
Kanghill tribesmen obviously formed part of the
Khārazm-Shāhī armies confronting the incoming
Mongols, and they suffered heavy losses when
Bukhārī and Samarkand were stormed by the
Mongols; there seems to have been some dynastic
connection between the Khārazm-Shāhs and the
Kanghill, if Dīwāyūnī's report that Sulṭān Dīdāl
al-Dīn's mother Terken Khāṭūn was a Kanghill is true (see Dīwāyūnī, tr. Boyle, i, 91, 105, 121, ii, 370,
405, and Barthold, op. cit., 415; Nasawī, however,
makes the mother a Dīndī, Barthold, Turkistan down
to the Mongol invasion, 361-2, 370, 415). Some of
the Kanghill not massacred by the Mongols must have
melted into the Turkish hordes making up a large
proportion of the Mongol armies; western travellers
to the court of the Mongol Khāns like John of
Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck mention them as
the Cangitae and Cangle respectively. Thereafter,
they disappear from recorded history. They can
hardly have been touched by Islam; indeed, the
only reference to their religious beliefs is that the
Mongol general Tughr Khān or Ulug Noyan em-
ployed a Kanghill versed in the art of using the yar
or rainstone (i.e., he was a shaman) to conjure up
rain during his campaign against the Chinese in
628/1231 (Dīwāyūnī-Boyle, i, 193; Boyle, The
successors of Genghis Khan, New York and London
1971, 37).

Bibliography: in addition to the references
given in the article, see especially Marquart's
detailed discussion of the Kanghill in his Über das
Volk des Khârâzim-Šâh in Abh. G. W. Götz, N. F.,
xxiii (1914), 163-72. (C. E. Bosworth)

KANGHRI [see ČANKIRI.]

KANGĪRA, the Nagarkot of Muslim historians of
India, occasionally referred to as Kōt Kangīgā,
is also the headquarters of the Ṭahill of the same
name in the Indian Pandžāb. Kangīra lies between
30° 5' N. and 76° 16' E. on the northern slope of the
KANSU, a province in the north-west of China, bounded in the east and south by the provinces of Szechwan and Shensi and in the west and north by the province of Chihli and the Sinkiang Uighur and Inner Mongolia Autonomus Regions. The province, first formed under the Great Khan Külüy in 1282 A.D., received its name from the towns in the extreme north-west, Kaucho (Changyeh) and Suchou (Kinchuan); both towns are already mentioned in the Hudud al-Islam and Gardzi, the former in the form Khândji (in the Mongol period Kamjil) and the latter as Shujirin or Sühiri.

1. To the end of the Mongol period. Until the thirteenth century A.D., this territory was for the most part under the domination of foreign peoples of Turkish (Uyghur) or Tibetan (Tangut) origin; immediately before the Mongol conquest there was a Tangut kingdom here under the Issa (or He-hsia) dynasty (1032-1227) with their capital at Ningšia (Yinchuan). Rashid al-Din, in giving a list of the twelve provinces (sheng, Chinese sheng) of China, divides the Tangut region into two, with Kinkin-fū (now Sien, the capital of Shensi) and Kamjil (Kancho) as their respective capitals. In actual fact, Kancho was the capital of Kansu; Kansu and Shensi were then, as later, combined in a single government, the only difference being that the residence of the governor was then in the capital of Shensi and not, as later, in the capital of Kansu. The boundary between Kansu and Shensi was formed by the Hwang Ho, so that Lanchow, the present-day capital of Kansu, then belonged to Shensi. In connection with Quengsien (i.e., Kinkin-fū, Sian) Marco Polo mentions Prince Mangalay (d. 1280, the Manggala of Rashid al-Din) Küblay's third son, as ruler of Tangut, while Rashid al-Din refers to his son Ananda; according to Rashid al-Din, he was the founder of Muslim dominance in this area. Born about 1270 (at the beginning of the 14th century he was thirty years of age), he was brought up by Muslim foster-parents; but it was only after the conversion of the Il-khan (Chayan) (ca. 1295) that he openly professed Islam. He converted the greater part of his army, numbering nearly 150,000 men to Islam, and the people of Tangut, except the peasantry, were likewise converted. Taken to task by his cousin the Great Khan Temür Öljëtï (1294-1307) for his conversion, Ananda remained faithful to Islam and after a period of interruption was restored to his dominion. In 1307 a party wished to raise him to the throne of the Khânate, but he was put to death after the success of a rival candidate, Temür's nephew Khayan (1307-1311). It was not until 1314 that Ananda's son Örüg-Temür was appointed prince of Tangut.

As Marco Polo shows, there were already Muslims in Kansu before Ananda's time; however, he says nothing about the dissemination of Islam south of the Hwang Ho. The Turkish-speaking Salor, who live at the present day on the southern banks of that river, are mentioned as living there as early as the Ming dynasty (1368-1644) and described as unruly subjects, although no Muslim records are recorded during this period. The story which reached Timur's territories about 1320 to 1321, to the effect that the period of the Ming dynasty had ordered the massacre of some 100,000 Muslims and had completely eradicated Islam in China finds no confirmation in any Chinese source.


2. In the post-Mongol period. After the collapse of the Yüan dynasty which took place in 1368,
Muslims in Kansu, as well as those of other provinces of China, were put under the rule of the newly-established Ming dynasty, which, at the beginning of the new regime, adopted a discriminatory attitude against non-Chinese. It oppressed 

Hsiu-hui or Muslims, and generally speaking, the Hsiu-hui under the Yuan dynasty were obliged to settle in China, and began to be assimilated to the Chinese way of life through intermarriage with native Chinese women. They were physically and linguistically sinicised as time went by; Hsiu-hui under the Ming dynasty gradually changed their original, Islamic surnames to Chinese ones (e.g., from Muhammad to Ma, etc.), and adopted Chinese languages; nevertheless, they adhered strictly to Islam. This process also affected Kansu Muslims, with some characteristics different from those of China proper.

In the early Ming period there were many Muslims in Kansu, while some of them are reported to have returned to Samarkand, according to the Ming Shih-lu or the Veritable Annals of the Ming Dynasty. At Kanchou, Liangchou and Suchou there were some Muslims who had newly emigrated from Central Asian countries in the middle Ming period (Ming Shih-lu, sub anno 1527), and some from the Komul region, with which the Ming dynasty had had political relations. Apart from such new-comers, native Muslims originating from the Yuan period greatly increased in number and were distributed in south-eastern parts of Kansu as far as adjacent parts of Sinkiang. There were also Muslims in districts of Kung-ch'eng-fu, Chinchou, T' внеou and Kuyian in the Kansu Province, according to the Ming Shih-lu and local gazetteers of the Ming dynasty.

In 1604 Father Benedict Gedé, who travelled from Agra through the Tarim Basin to Ming China in search of the historic Cathay and who reached Suchou, mentions "Saracen", that is to say, Muslims, who lived in Suchou segregated from the Chinese there. Though his description is in some parts ambiguous, we may conclude that there were Muslims at Suchou in the late Ming period.

Under the Ch'ing dynasty, which succeeded the Ming in 1644, the situation of Muslims in Kansu, Ninghsia and Shensi changed little; however, we have much more information on the Kansu Muslims under the Ch'ing, as seen in the Ch'ing Shih-lu and other historical sources and local gazetteers of the dynasty. In the Ch'ing period, Kansu had one of the densest concentrations of Chinese Muslims. Chinese-speaking Muslims of Ch'ing China were generally called Hsiu-min ("Islamic people") in Chinese. The main habitats of Kansu Muslims were Kanchou, Liang-chou, Lanchou, Kuyian, Chingchou, Houchou, Chingyuan, Piliang, Fuching, etc.; other places adjacent to Kansu where they lived were Hsining, Hsiunhua, Kuetit in Chinghia Province, and Ninghsia, Chin-chi-pao in Ninghsia Province.

The size of the Chinese Muslim population in Kansu is unclear: M. Broomhall (1910) estimated it at 1,086,597 (30% of the total population of Kansu Province in 1953), and that of Chinghai at 527,059; thus the total population is 1,613,000. The size of Broomhall's estimate is not clear, but, as compared with the present situation, these seem to be acceptable statistics. Generally speaking, Kansu Muslims are more densely distributed in the southern part of Kansu, that is, south of the Yellow River.

Islam in Kansu as in other provinces of China, is that of the Hanafi rite, with some influence from the Sāfīī rite, as is shown by investigations of D'Ollone on Islamic legal practices prevalent in modern Kansu (D'Ollone, Recherches sur les Musulmans chinois).

The most important feature among the Muslims of Kansu is the prevalence of Sāfīīism, apparently originating in the middle of the 18th century. In contemporary Ch'ing sources, one of the Safi teachings of Kansu Islam is called Hsin-chiao (the "New Sect" or "New Teaching"), which was reported for the first time in 1761 immediately after the Ch'ing conquest of Eastern Turkestan. One Ma Ming-hsin, a native of Arting, Kansu, started to spread the so-called "New Teaching" in the district of the Salar tribes in Hsingh after his return in 1761 from a period of religious study at Yarkand and Kashgar in Eastern Turkestan. With the support of Sā-sū-shih-san and Hu-ma-liu-hi, both Salar mullahs, he founded the "New Sect" in 1762. This propagated a mystical ritualism characterized by: (1) loud chanting of religious songs, as opposed to the low chanting by the Old Sect or Old Teaching; (2) prayers with head-shaking and body movement in a dance-like manner—foot-stamping, hand-waving, and face turning up towards heaven; (3) belief in miracles, visions, apparition of spirits and prediction of good or bad omens; and (4) worship of Muslim saints and their tombs. Ma Ming-hsin was revered as the saintly founder of the Sāfīīs in China, a forerunner of the "New Sect" founded by Ma Ming-hsin as a reform movement reacting against the traditional sects, generally called Ancient or Old Sects (K'u-pai, Chiin-pai and K'u-hsing-pai).

In ca. 1760-80 the centre of the Hsin-chiao was at Hsiühua, a town near Hsingh, where Hsin-chiao adherents quarrelled incessantly among themselves in the 1760s and 1770s; and in 1781, Ma Ming-hsin and Sā-sū-shih-san led an attack on the Muslims belonging to the Ancient Sect. Government suppression of sectarian strife led Hsin-chiao adherents to open rebellion against the Ch'ing dynasty in that year, and, though it was suppressed by the Ch'ing army, a second revolt broke out in 1783 at Shi-feng-pao, Kansu. Since the 19th century, major centres of Hsin-chiao adherents have been in Chang-chia-chiian, Kansu, and in Chi-chi-pao, Hsinghia.

In 1862 a new revolt broke out at Ch'in-chi-pao, where Ma Hua-lung who came from the direct "apostolic" line of Ma Ming-hsin, maintained his quarters. Ma Hua-lung is reported to have been a mystical saint who was able to perform miracles; but his rebellion was suppressed in 1873 by the Ch'ing army. The mystic order of Ma Hua-lung was called Djahriyya from the 19th century onwards (D'Ollone); the headship of the Order passed to Ma Yuan-ch'ang, a disciple of Ma Hua-lung, who had his headquarters at Chang-chia-chiian, Kansu. Ma Yuan-ch'ang is mentioned by G. Andrew who visited him in the early 20th century; he died in 1920 during an earthquake which occurred in Kansu during that year.

Besides Hsin-chiao, another characteristic of the Sāfīīs of Kansu Islam is the institution of ming-kuan. Ming-kuan, especially the Four Great Ming-kuan, was reported in Ch'ing sources for the first time in 1786; the Six Great Ming-kuan were also reported in 1943. They are: (1) the Hu-fei-yeh sect, including Pi-chiu-ch'ang kung-pei, Lin-tao kung-pei, etc.; (2) the Ka-ti-lin-yeh sect, including Ta-kung-pei, Yang-men, etc.; (3) the K'u-pu-lin-yeh sect; (4) the Sha lüa-lin-yeh sect; (5) the Sai-nai-lo-lo-lung-yeh sect; and (6) the Che-ho-lin-yeh Djahriyya sect.
According to the missionary D'Ollone, who made a study of aboriginal peoples in the borderlands of China in 1906-9, the tombs of three Islamic saints were revered among Kansu Muslims. Míng-kuan adherents were also called *Kíng-pí-ch'iao*, that is, "followers of Tomb Teaching". Thus, the Dzhakhryyan sect of Kansu Muslims may be said to be a jie of *míng-kuan*, tomb-worshippers.


**KANTARA,** pl. *kańtir*, means in Arabic (1) bridge, particularly a bridge of masonry or stone, one of the most famous of which is that of *Sandýa* [*40*]; also (2) aqueduct (especially in the plural), dam, and finally (3) high building, castle (similarly *kańdul* = aqueduct from *kastl* = castle; see *KANAT*); cf. *TA*, iii, 509; *Dozy, Supplément*, ii, 412; de Goeje, *BGA*, iv, 334; and particularly R. Geyer in the *SB Ak. Wien*, cxxi/6 (1905), 114-9. The original meaning of the word "arch, stone archway", is found in the earliest Arabic lexicographers; cf. Dozy-de Goeje, *Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne par Édris*, 369, *Phir* [*8*], a bridge of wood or boats, is the opposite of *kańtara*, which is of stone; in time, however, the two words came to be used as synonyms (see Dozy, *Suppl.*, i, 194). No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the origin of the word. The oldest form is found in a verse of *Tara* (iv, 22; see The *Diwan* of the six ancient Arabic poets, ed. Ahlwardt, 1870, 55). On account of this very early occurrence of the word, Yǎgǔt (iv, 187) considers the word to be genuine Arabic. But we may with considerable certainty regard it as a loan-word. Voilliers and Geyer thought that it was borrowed from Latin or Greek. The former connected (*ZDMG*, ii, 376; *ZA*, vii, 100-1) *kańtara* with the medival Latin word *centrum* (French *centre*, arch, vault), while Geyer (*op. cit.*, 118-9) sought the original in *kano̱diš* = basket, *cantherius* = wickerwork used in the making of roofs and buildings, or in *ký̱mptra*, *ký̱mptrun* = depositsory (cf. also *ký̱mtry̱* = rounding, curve), from which Voilliers (*ZDMG*, ii, 502) derived Egyptian Arabic *kumfar*. But all these explanations are to be rejected, because there are phonetic objections to them and they partly rely for the meanings of the words cited on obsolete, farfetched glosses; cf. for objections to these explanations, Fränkel in *ZA*, xix, 270-1, and Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, 408. *Kantara* is most probably to be derived from the Araunic, and, as Nöldeke, *op. cit.,* thinks, in the first place from *kuńar* = hoop, arch (see Payne-Smith, *Thesaur. Syriac*, col. 3597; note specially *kuńar* in Ibar Bahlīf, *Lexic.* col. 770). The above-mentioned word *difar* also comes from the Araunic (*Fränkel, Dir. Araucan. Fremdwörter im Arab.*, Leiden 1886, 285 and D. H. Müller in *WZKM*, i, 31), but can actually be traced back to the Assyrian or Accadian (cf. Meissner in *ZA*, ix, 269, and Zimmern, *Akadische Fremdwörter*, Leipzig 1915, 31).

Al-*Kantara* has survived in Spanish in the diminutives *alecantarilla* = little bridge, gutter and *alecantarillado* = arched aqueduct; see Dozy-Engelmann, *Glosario des mots espagnols y portugais dérivés de l'arabe*, Leiden 1869, 47; *Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana por la Real Academia Española*, xiii, Madrid 1899, xv; J. Oliver Asín, *Historia del nombre Madrid*, Madrid 1959, index.

Al-*Kantara* and al-*Kanṭār* are frequently found —sometimes with descriptive additions, e.g., Kanṭār Fir'awn—as names for places like quarters of a city (notably in Baghdad) in areas where Arabic was, or is, spoken in the mediaeval or modern East. In his geographical dictionary (iv, 180, 187-92, vi, 179-80) Yākūt gives a dozen places named al-*Kantara* and four called Kanṭār (cf. also, for example, the indices to al-*Tabari, Annales*, 759-60, and Ibn al-*Aṭīr, Kāmil*, iii, 790). For the numerous districts of Baghdad named after particular bridges under the Caliphate see the index to *Le Strange, Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate*, London 1900, 368.

Of the places named al-*Kanṭār*, the following are worthy of special mention:

1. An oasis on the southern slopes of the Atlas in Algeria at the exit of a narrow pass through which runs the road and railway from Constantine to the desert regions; it is a station on the Constantin-Biskra line, 35 miles north of the latter. This, the most northern oasis in Algeria, consists of three villages with about 3,500 inhabitants and possesses a very dense date grove. From its situation it was an important military station and, as Roman inscriptions found there show, settled in ancient times. It is presumably identical with the station *Ad Caulem Herculis* of the Roman itineraries (see *Dessau* in *Pauly-Wissowa*, iii, 1341). The name al-*Kantara* is derived from the Roman bridge, restored in 1862 by the French, which spans in one huge arch the ravine, the 150 feet wide Fummi al-Šahār = the mouth of the Sahārā (so-called by the inhabitants), through which flows the Wād al-*Kantara* (cf., for example, *Vivien de St. Martin, Dict. de Geographie Universelle*, Paris 1879, i, 66 and Kobelt, *Reiserinnerungen aus Algerien und Tunis*, 1883, 322).

2. Ałcántara, a little town of great antiquity in the province of Cáceres (distric of Estremadura) in Spain, near the Portuguese frontier, with 3,200 inhabitants. It receives its name from an imposing granite bridge, built in 105 A.D., which crosses the Tago in six great arches to the northwest of the town. The place is also famous for the religiously knorightly ordered founded there in 1176 to defend the frontier against the Moors, which became called the Order of Ałcántara after its headquarters were moved to this town in 1213 (see *Raederker* *Spain and Portugal*, Leipzig 1912, 459).

3. A small town with a mosque in Egypt, on the Asiatic side of the Suez canal, half-way between Port Sa'id and Ismā'īliyya, a station on the railway connecting these two towns. It lies on a low narrow
several mistakes. Following the information of Ahmed Wefik (op. cit.), who mentions Karâ Hisâr as the chief place of a nahiye of the kada' of Serik in the sandjak of Adalia, and the information of Ewliya Celebi (Seyahatnâmesi, ix, 290) according to which the place was built at the foot of a mountain called Serek dağ, Mordtmann in E1 and Besim Darkot in IA have sought to identify it with the large village of Serik, a real centre of a kada' in the plain between the Aksu and the Köprü Su, nearer to this last river. This identification of the locality is incompatible with the data of the same text of Ewliya, which place it to the west of the Aksu, four hours' journey from Antalya and an hour to the north of the village of Kündu (still existing) on the one hand, and on the other with the information of the same, as well as of al-Kâkashandi (Sûbûn, v, 346), which places it on a lofty hill. Süleyman Pîkri Ertan (Antalya vilayetî tarihi, Istanbul 1940, 90) wished incorrectly to place it at the ancient town of Silleryon, a hypothesis compatible with the data on the elevated site but not with the information on distance and placing it in relation to the river. In fact, there is no doubt that it can be identified with the ancient town of Pergun in terms of the above characteristics. Recognized since the 19th century by Krause in his articles Pamphylia and Perge in the Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste, Sect. 3, vol. x (1838), 244, and vol. xv-xvi (1847), 435, but without comment and information on sources, then by X. de Planhol (De la plaine pamphylienne aux lacs piétidiens, Paris 1938, 105, 185), it has been set out clearly in detail by Barbara Fleming (Landscfenziehe von Pamphyliden, Pietsidien und Lykiden im Spätmittelalter, Wiesbaden 1954, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlands, xxv/f, 101-2; see equally the index, s.v. for the numerous mentions of this town).

7. Develî Karâ Hisâr, i.e., the Karâshâr of Develî (develenî Karâshârî in Neghî, ZDMG, xv, 341, and Leunclavius, Hist. Musulm., 334); also named after the district of Develî (Houtsma, Recueil, iii, 104) to distinguish it from other towns of the same name. This town, situated in Asia Minor, 45 km. to the south-west of Kayseriye, is already frequently mentioned in the history of the Saçakids (Houtsma, Recueil, iv, passim). It belonged originally to the possessions of the Banû Etre'nî (cf. Max van Berchem, Matræsca, Pt. 3, 41 and 48), and then to that of the Karâmân-oghullar and was conquered in 794/1391 by Bâyazid I (Neghî, loc. cit.); at the time of the conquest of Karâmân by Muhammed II in 879/1474, it surrendered to the Ottomans (Sa'd al-Dîn, i, 550). At the end of the 17th century, the district of Develî Karâ Hisâr formed a kada' dependent on Kayseriyê Dîkmânumûdê, 620. The town then declined, without doubt due to the insalubrity of the swamps (Sultan Saçak) which extend to the approaches of the town, and the consequence of this was the transfer of the centre of the kada' to Develî (or Evrek), to the south of Kayseri and 40 km. to the east, whereas Karâ Hisâr, at the end of the 19th century, was no more than a nahiye of the kada' of Indjiye. This transfer has been at the source of a whole series of confusions between the two towns (Ahmed Wefik, Leâhêj, 580, and Cunliffe, Travels and Asie, i, 304, 320, give information which is quite obscure and false). The town, established anew as a kaza in 1946, took the name of Yeşil Hisar. Of the ancient fortifications of Develî Karâ Hisâr, only insignificant fragments remain; the town, known for its fruit production, is situated at the foot of some hills, in the midst of extensive gardens (Kimeir, Journey, 109; Hamilton, ii, 284).

There were several hundred houses at the end of the last century, with an increase to 5,800 inhabitants in 1950. In the neighbourhood of Develî Karâ Hisâr, 3 km. to the south-west, are the ruins of Zindjiar Kâfesi, considered formerly to be the ancient Nora (W. F. Ainsworth, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, London 1842, 1, 210) and now identified with Çyeastra (W. M. Calder and G. E. Bean, A classical map of Asia Minor, London 1958).

8. Karâ Hisâr in the land of Uğümân (Vâkû', iv, 45): perhaps this is meant to be the Karadjâ Hisâr, also named Karadjâ Shehîr, near İnönü in the territory of origin of the Ottoman Sultans, a place which is often described even in the ancient chronicles by the name of Karâ Hisâr.

9. Karâ Hisâr in the territory of Ibn Torght (Ibn Faḍl Allâh, op. cit., 350); this is, however, impossible to identify, unless it is an ancient name for Torghtu Kaşâbasî near Mânisâ.

10. Karâ Hisâr, chief-town of the kada' of Našu'î-khan (Našâlîn), vilayet of Ankara (Ahmed Wefik, op. cit.). One encounters several villages of this name in the boundaries of the said kaza.

11. Hanâmân Karâ Hisâr, village of the nahiye of Güneyînizî, kada' of Sîvri Hisâr, vilayet of Eskîcehir, 17 km. to the east of the chef-lieu of the kaza.

12. Van Karâshârî (Ewliya, op. cit., iv, 275-9), which the traveller visited on the route from Van to Kotur, and of which he says that the Kurds call it Karadja Kale; this is today a village of the kaza of Saray (newly called Özalp).

A certain number of other places of the name of Karâ Hisâr figure in the gazetteers of the Anatolian villages; none of them have any historical importance. See the article of Besim Darkot in IA for the enumeration of several of them.

[J. H. Mordtmann-[X. de Planhol]]

Karâ Kalpâk [see Karakalpak].

Karâ Kalîl [see Gandarî].

Karâ Khânîds [see İlek-Khâns].

Karâ Khîtây, the usual name in Muslim sources of the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries of the Kität people, mentioned in Chinese sources from the 4th century A.D. onwards as living on the northern fringes of the Chinese empire; during the course of the 6th/12th century a group of them migrated into the Islamic lands of Central Asia and established a domination there which endured for some eighty years.

In the Orkhon inscriptions of Outer Mongolia, the royal names of the Tu-chueh or Turks (ca. 732 A.D.), the Kität are mentioned as enemies of the Turks and as living to the east of the Turkish homeland on the Orkhan and Selenga rivers. Ethnically and linguistically, the Kität were most probably Mongols rather than Tungus, as some earlier orientalists surmised, though there is a possibility that they spoke a language of their own, unrelated to the above two groups (see the discussions in Wittfogel and Fénel, History of Chinese society: Liao, 21-3, and Sir Gerard Clauson, Turk, Mongol, Tungus, in Asia Major, N.S. viii (1960), 120-1, 223). There must also have been considerable Uyghur Turkish influence on them when they were subject to the Kâ nghi of the Eastern Turks.

In Chinese sources, the Kität are first called the Ch'i-tan (K'i-tan) and then, after 947, the Liao. In
the period of chaos after the downfall of the T'ang dynasty (690), the expansionist Kitāb-überran northern China and established there a ruling dynasty which, whilst retaining its basic steppe ethos, became at least superficially Sinicized, so that Chinese annals account them a native dynasty; southern China, on the other hand, remained in the hands of the indigenous Sung dynasty (960–1279). The Liao empire stretched from the western edge of the Altaic mountains and the Uyghur lands in the west, and their original name of Kitai, in the form Khitai or Khatai, was applied by the Muslims to northern China, whence older English Cathay, Russian Kitay, Greek Kitâla, etc. for the whole country of China (see Sir Henry Yule, Cathay and the way thither, London 1913–16, i, 145; in Muslim usage Čin, Arabic form Sin [qv.] became the term reserved for southern China).

Between 1116 and 1123, however, the Liao of northern China were overthrown by a fresh wave of barbarian invaders from the north, the Tungusic Jurchen of the Amur-Ussuri basin and northern Manchuria, who formed the Chin ("golden") dynasty, Mongol Altun Khans. A part of the Kitai remained in China with the Chin and later, in the time of Chingiz Khân, were able successfully to rebel and restore the Kitai kingdom as a Mongol vassal state. Muslim sources mention raids westwards by the "Khitais" on Islamic territories adjoining the Semi-rečy during the 5th/6th century (see Ibn al-Athîr, ix, 209–10, incursion of the Khiṭaṭiyâna in 408/1017–18), but these attacks may well have been made by Mongol groups, perhaps the Nayman, pushed westwards by the expansion of the Kitai proper in northern China (see Barthold, Histoire des Tures d'Asie centrale, 95). It was the migration of ca. 519/1125, and thereafter by the Čıtaṭy ("black") Khitai (in the Latin of John of Plano Carpini, 1246, niger Kitan), Chinese Čin ("western") Liao, which was really significant for the eastern Islamic world. One more southerly group moved into eastern Turkestan, but came up against the branch of Ilek Khânis of Kârâ-khânîds [qv.] ruling in Kâshghâria. Arslân Khâni Ahmad b. Hasan defeated them before they could reach Kâshghâr and captured their leader. Ibn al-Athîr, xi, 53, places this battle in 522/1128, which is perhaps too early, since in a letter from the Sâlûqût to the Khâni of eastern Persia, Sandjar, to the caliph's vizier, dated 527/1133, the victory is described as a recent event.

The adventures of the other group of Khitai are described by Diuwayni, tr. Boyle, i, 354 ff. It may be that we should regard these merely as the right wing of a general Čıtaṭy advance along a broad front, successful in breaking through where the left wing thrust into Kâshghâria failed. At all events, this second group of the westwards by a more northern route, through the Khâni lands on the upper Yenisei, building the settlement of Emil to the east of Lake Bâlkhash, which they used as a base for intervening in the Kârâ-khânîd principality in the Semi-rečy. By this time, their numbers had swollen to 40,000 tents. The Kârâ-khânîd ruler tried to win the Khitai over as allies against his own unruly Čarulûk and Kangûl tribesmen, but instead found himself deposed. The Čıtaṭy Khâni leader, whose name appears in Chinese sources as Yeh-li Tsâ-shih (d. 537/1143) now, after a half-hearted attempt to organize a revanche and regain the Liao homeland in China, made the town of Balâšâghân [qv.], in the Ču valley his base for a series of attacks on the surrounding Turkish tribes and principalities; against the Kûrğiz and Kangûl in the steppes, and against the Kârâ-khânîds in Khotan and Kâshghâr, where Ibrâhîm b. Arslân Khâni Ahmad probably died in battle against them. In 530/1143 Mahmûd Khân b. Arslân Muhammed of Samarqand was defeated at Khüdîjad in Farghana.

After the Čıtaṭy had halted for four years, internal disputes among the Samarqand Khânate led open the whole of Transoxania to them. Nomadic Karulûk tribesmen at odds with Mahmûd Khân appealed to the Čıtaṭy against their overlords. Mahmûd had recourse to his own suzerain Sandjar, and the Sâlûqût Sultan now invaded Transoxania from Kûrûsân with a large army. In Safar 536/ September 1141 a bloody battle was fought at the Kâtûn Steppe in Uşhrûsân to the south of the middle Sûr Daryâ. Despite a probable numerical superiority, the Muslims were routed with huge losses, and Sandjar and Mahmûd Khân abandoned Transoxania and fled to Kûrûsân; this clash between the conventionally organized Muslim army and the Čıtaṭy nomadic horde was, indeed, a foretaste of what was to happen when Chingiz Khân's Mongols appeared in the Islamic lands. The Čıtaṭy now occupied Samarqand and Bûkharâ, and Yeh-li Ta-shih sent an army against Khurâzam, compelling the Khûrâzam-Shâh Atsîl [qv.] to pay an annual tribute of 30,000 dinârs. The lands under Čıtaṭy control came to stretch from the borders of the Kûrîgiz country in the north to Bâlkhash in the south (occupied in 540/1153), and from Khûrâzam in the west to the Uyghur lands of eastern Turkestan (see the maps in A. Hermann, An historical atlas of China, Edinburgh 1966, 38–40, and Wittfogel and Fong, op. cit., 658). The news of the Čıtaṭy victory over the Muslim forces at the Kâtûn Steppe filtered through to the Crusaders in the Levant and thence to Christian Europe, giving fresh impetus to the legends about Prester John, the powerful Christian monarch who supposedly ruled in Inner Asia and who was attacking the Muslims from the rear (that these legends were in circulation before this time is suggested by G. F. Beckingham, The achievements of Prester John, Inaugural Lecture, University of London 1966).

The Čıtaṭy leaders are called in the Islamic sources by the title Gür-Khân, and the personal names of the successive rulers are known only in their Chinese forms (see below). Dâuwayni, tr. i, 354, and Dîżaďiî, Ta bądź-ti Nâşiri, ed. Habîbî, ii, 96, tr. Raverty, ii, 911 explain that Gür-Khân means "Supreme Khân", Khuîn-i Khând; Barthold, Histoire des Tures d'Asie centrale, 97, n. 1, connected the first element with the old Turkish word Kür, Kül, "noble, courageous", found in names and titles of the Orkhon inscriptions, giving a meaning like "Hajj something-Khân". Pace Barthold's categorical assertion that "The Qara-Khâni kingdom was vastly different from the usual type of nomad empires" (Four studies on the history of Central Asia, i, 29), the Čıtaṭy empire was in many ways typical of the steppe empires established by a Eurasian steppe confederation, despite the partial Sinicization of the Čıtaṭy themselves. It is probable that, like all nomadic confederations, they were not an ethnically homogeneous group; the successes of the first Gür-Khân doubtless attracted numbers of Turks, Tauguts and perhaps even Tungus to swell the original core of the Čıtaṭy. They were a military aristocracy of cavalrmen, spread thinly over the lands which they dominated, but with their main concentration at the Gûr-Khân's ordu or army camp outside Balâšâghân.
in the Semirečye. The Chinese history of the dynasty, the Liao Shih (completed in 1344), mentions a census taken in 546/1152 by the Gür-Khān Yi-Iheh. This enumerated 84,500 households with adult males in them, but this figure probably included the indigenous Muslim population of Balasagūn and its hinterland as well as the Karā Khiṭāy tribesmen; even reckoning two fighting men per household, the numbers of the Karā Khiṭāy cannot have been all that large (see Wittfogel and Fong, 659-60).

Nor was there any administrative centralization, despite the fact that they did not follow the practice in other nomadic empires of granting out appanages to relatives and others of high rank; the first Gür-Khān is said not to have entrusted to any man command of more than two hundred warriors. Except in Balasagūn, where, as noted above, the local Karā Khānīd ruler was displaced (although the population of the town remained largely Muslim), local dynasties continued elsewhere to exist as the Gür-Khāns' vassals. In some places, there were appointed permanent representatives of the Gür-Khān (Chinese chên-huo "state supervisor", Turkish başbak, Arabic-Persian shāhān) side-by-side with the local ruler; a province like Khīrāzam was visited periodically by the Karā Khiṭāy tributary court whilst at the beginning of the 7th/13th century the sādars or religious leaders in Bukhārā of the Burūn family (on whom see O. Prisak, Al-i Burūn, in Isl., xxx (1952), 81-90) took the tribute of the city in person to the Gür-Khān's ordu, just as later under the Golden Horde the prince of Muscovy took his tribute to the capital at Sarāy. The Karā Khiṭāy administration was therefore primarily a fiscal one, and beyond the collection of taxes, the subject territories were left largely to their local rulers. Ibn al-Aḥār, xi, 56, says that the Gür-Khān imposed a tax of one dinār per annum on each household of the conquered peoples, but we know that tribute in kind was also collected. Barthold thought that the dinār levy on each family was a specifically Chinese feature, but it seems to have been only one method followed amongst several in a far-from-uniform system; one Chinese source says that the rural populace around Balasagūn paid a tithe on their crops to the Gür-Khān. The Gür-Khāns coined their own copper currency on the Liao and Chinese pattern, with the regular period inscribed in Chinese characters, but the vassal states continued to mint their own Islamic-type coins, and as we have just seen, the unit of the dinār was recognised by the Karā Khiṭāy for tax-collecting purposes (see Wittfogel and Fong, 661-2, 664, 672-3).

Barthold also asserted in his E1 article Karā khitāy that the "language of the government seems to have been Chinese", but the linguistic and cultural structure of Central Asia at this time was complex and reflected the mingling of races, cultures and faiths. In the late Ming dynasty, the Karā Khiṭāy set a Chinese imprint on the administration and culture of the lands under their control, and Muslim authors noted a few Chinese words like fū-ma "imperial son-in-law" for the Gür-Khān's son-in-law (Dhuwayd-Boyle, i, 290, 292) and p'i-ya, Chinese p'ai-tāi, "tablet, insignia of a government official's authority" (ibid., i, 538; Aawi, ḥabūb al-ālabb, ed. Browne, ii, 385). The first Gür-Khān bestowed Chinese official titles and used the Chinese script for solemn decrees, but the number of Chinese letters at their ordū can never have been very large. They must have called upon Muslim scholars and secretaries for their correspondence in Persian and the Arabic script with their Muslim vassals, and probably upon Uyghur officials for correspondence in Turkish and the Uyghur script with vassals in eastern Turkestan.

The Karā Khiṭāy never adopted Islam, as did eventually the Mongol Khāns in the Islamic world, but they displayed the traditional tolerance of the steppes towards all faiths. Even though Islam was especially identified with the resistance in Transoxania by the Karākhānids and by Sanjūr, they did not systematically persevere Muslims, as did their brief suppliant Khūšīq (see below) in Kāshgārā. A contemporary Muslim chronicle like Ṣāḥib-i Ṣamāndī gives an anecdote about the first Gür-Khān's boundless justice, his deference to the Sūdar of Būkhārā and his removal of an oppressive representative of the Karā Khiṭāy administration there (Cabīr mokbīla, ed. Browne, 21, revised tr. 21-5). Dżizjālī, the historian of the Ghūrids, is also remarkably enthusiastic about them; he praises the first Gür-Khān for his just rule and respect for Muslim sensibilities, and even purveys a tale that one of the later Gür-Khāns had secretly become a Muslim (Ṭabaḥāt-i Nāṣīrī, ii, 96, tr. 912-13). Muslims retained leading positions in the Karā Khiṭāy administration; the wealthy merchant Mahmūd Tāy is mentioned by Dhuwayd, tr. i, 337-8, as being vizier to the last Gür-Khān.

However, the religious tolerance and impartiality of the Karā Khiṭāy undoubtedly permitted adherents of non-Islamic faiths to flourish more openly in Turkestan than under the orthodox Muslim Karākhānids. A great period of missionary activity and enterprise opened for the Nestorian Christian Church in Inner Asia; the patriarch Elias III (1176-90) founded a metropolis see in Kāshgār whose jurisdiction also included the Semirečye; and the oldest of the Syriac-inscribed Christian gravestones from the Ču valley in the Semirečye stem from this period (see Barthold, Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien bis zur mongolischen Eroberung, Tübingen-Leipzig 1901, 57 ff.; idem, Histoire des Tures d'Asie centrale, 99-101; the earliest inscription published by Chwolson dates from 1180). There were Chinese artisans working in Samarkand at this time, and the Jewish communities in Khiva, Samarkand, etc. were flourishing, according to the evidence of a Jewish traveller in Persia like Benjamin of Tudela (see W. J. Fischel, The Jews of Central Asia (Khorasan) in medieval times, transl. from the Russian by A. A. Ardellick, in Historia Judaica, vii (1945), 29-50). Grosset commented with some justice that "the foundation of the Qara Khiṭāy empire may be viewed as a reaction against the work of Islamization accomplished by the Qaraghānids" (L'Empire des steppes, Paris 1952, 221).

As for the Karā Khiṭāy's own religion, we can glean very little from the sources. Ibn al-Aḥār, xi, 55, calls the first Gür-Khān a Mahāchāna. Muslim writers usually, however, simply call them "monologists", but we may find here that Buddhism, which had overlaid the original shamanism of the Chi-tan in China, was widespread amongst them.

One may accordingly say that the receptiveness of the Karā Khiṭāy environment to differing cultural and religious traditions, and the consequent encouragement of the flowering of these traditions under the dynasty's relaxed rule, constitutes a certain achievement in human civilization, one which anticipates the better side of the succeeding fan mongolica. Thus the Chinese connections of the Karā Khiṭāy probably facilitated the journeys of Muslim traders into Mongolia and perhaps even as far as northern China. Acts of violence and oppression towards the subject
people can never have been wholly absent, and these may have increased towards the end of their rule. Yet our admittedly fragmentary knowledge of the trends of the period allows us to go some way with Mariu's approximation of Karâ Khi'tây culture (Uc'tar Muhi'ddins Nu-ras-ud-din Samu'ayn), and to regard Borchard's dismissal of the achievements of the dynasty as negligible (Histoire des Torres d'Asie centrale, 98-9) as unduly harsh.

The chronology of the line of Karâ Khi'tây Gur-Khan can be pieced together from the Liào Shih and from odd items of information in the Islamic sources (e.g., the recording by Ibn al-Athîr, xi, 57, of the first Gur-Khans's death in Rajah 537 [Jan-Feb. 1143]). In his standard Manuel de gêndalologie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam, Zamoun made no attempt to deal with the Karâ Khi'tây, although Marquart, op. cit., 237-8, had given a substantially correct list of their rulers. After the death of the original Gur-Khan Ye-h-li Ts'hih (1124-43), his widow T'a-pu-yen (named in Djuwaini-Boyle, i, 356, as Kuyan, honorific title Kan-Cien, regnal title Hien-ch'ing) reigned 1144-50. There succeeded the Gur-Khans Yi-Lieh's regnal titles Shou-kung (1152-63); after his death the last Gur-Khan, Yi-lieh's younger son Chi-hu-ku (1178-1211, d. 1213). The fact that the Karâ Khi'tây dominions were ruled by women for two out of these five reigns is significant evidence for the matriarchal trend in Karâ Khi'tây society; in China proper, the Liào empress dowagers had traditionally wielded great influence in the state. See on these questions of chronology, Wittfogel and Fêng, 620-1, 627 ff.; 672.

The Khârazm-shâhs from Il Arsalan (531/1136-567/1172) onwards endeavoured at various times to throw off the yoke of the Karâ Khi'tây, but their withholding of tribute were normally followed by Karâ Khi'tây invasions which re-asserted their overlordship. The Shâh Tekshih (596/1197-597/1200) owed his throne to the help of the Gur-Khan Ye-h-li's son-in-law Fuma, but he later renounced his allegiance, adding the oppressiveness of the Karâ Khi'tây tax-collectors and raising the banner of djihâd against the infidels; in the words of Ibn al-Athîr, xi, 248, he rebelled "out of zeal for the dignity of his throne and for the faith". The Karâ Khi'tây in turn now supported Tekshih's younger brother and earlier rival for the throne, Sultan Shâh, and helped him to seize several towns in northern Khurâsans (576/1181). In the last decades of the 6th/12th century and the opening years of the 7th/13th century, the Karâ Khi'tây aided Tekshih and his son and successor 'Allâ Al-Dîn Muhammad in their rivalry with the Ghûrids of Afghanistan [q.v.]; thus in 594/1198 the Gur-Khans sent an army across the Oxus to recover the vassal city of Balkh from the Ghûrids; the Karâ Khi'tây were, however, defeated, and this led to reconciliation between them and the Khârazm Shâh.

After his eventual crushing of the Ghûrids, 'Allâ Al-Dîn Muhammad had ambitions to extend Khârazmian control over the whole of Transoxiana and to reduce the last vestiges of Karâghhânid rule there. This necessarily involved clashing with the Karâ Khi'tây suzerains of the province. A general revolt flared up in eastern Turkestan amongst the Gur-Khans' Muslim vassals, and it was on the crest of these disorders that the Nayan Mongol Kâliuq rose to power there after his flight westwards before Çingiz Khân [q.v.]. The last Karâghhânid ruler in Samarkand, Uctum Khan b. Ibrâhîm (600/1204-608/1212), attempted to throw off Karâ Khi'tây control, offended by the Gur-Khans' refusal to grant him the hand of a daughter in marriage; but he had his capital temporarily occupied by a Karâ Khi'tây force (probably in 606/1209-10), and the marriage in fact later took place. Uctum Khan then allied with the Khârazm Shâh to defeat the Karâ Khi'tây near Talas in 607/1210, and although the Gur-Khans defeated Kâliuq, the appearance of a Mongol force under Çingiz's general Kûliûg in the west, the Karâ Khi'tây dominions were partitioned between the fiercely anti-Muslim Kûliûg in Kâshghâria and the Semi-roche, and the Khârazm Shâh in Transoxiana. The remaining members of the Karâ Khi'tây hord must have been caught up in the armies of the Mongols.

However, their rule was perpetuated indirectly in one corner of the eastern Islamic world. Shortly after the collapse of 608/1211, one of the Karâ Khi'tây commanders called Dârâk Hâdiûb entered the service of the Khârazm Shâhs and eventually founded the principality of Kûliûg Khi'tânis in Kûshâb (see BORAK HABITIM, Zamoun, 237, and Wittfogel and Fêng, 626, 655-7).

Bibliography: The chief Muslim sources include Ibn al-Athîr, Djuwaini and the standard Sâldûjûk sources (e.g., Râwandi, Bundârî) for the establishment of Karâ Khi'tây power in Transoxiana, and Djuwaini again and Djuûdûjânî for the later phases. Some of the relevant Chinese sources were translated in E. Bretschneider, Mediaeval researches from eastern Asiatic sources, London 1910, i, 268-35, but the Chinese sources are utilized directly by K. A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-Shing, History of Chinese society: Liao (907-1125), in Trans. American Philosophical Society, N.S. xxxvi (Philadelphia 1946), 619-74.


KARRA KIRGIZ [see KIRGIZ].

KARRA-KÖL (Turkish "black lake"), KARKUL, the name of various lakes in Central Asia and of a modern town in the Uzbek SSR.

The best-known lake is that lying at the western extremity of the Zarafshân River in Soghdia (modern Uzbekistan), midway between Buhhârâ and Çârdjîy; it fed the Medeaeval Amu Shâh reservoirs, see Avariul. 2). The basin in which it lay was known as the Sâmândjan basin, see Wâshîn, 315; and Ibn Hawkal, ed. Ramers, 485, tr. Ramers and Wiet, 466. In Nâshâkî's Tahrik-i Buhhârâ, ed. Schefer, 17, tr. Frye, 19, the lake is given both the Turkish name of Kârâ-Köl and the Iranian one of Bâgrin-farâkh "extensive basin", and is said to have been 20 farsâqân long by one farsâqân wide.

In history, this lake has been identified with the Karâ köl mentioned in the Old Turkish Orkhon inscriptions (8th century), Kûltîgï N. 2, where it is described as the scene of a battle between the Tiu-ku or Eastern Turks under the prince Kûltîgen and the rebellious Az people (possibly the Tûrgesh), cf.
Khalva (1226/1812) the Karakalpak too had to submit to the Khan of Khiva. They made frequent attempts to throw off this yoke; in 1829 they even captured and held the town of Kungur for a time. After the suppression of this uprising, a body of them migrated to Farghāna. In 1855 the leader of the rebel Karakalpak, Ir-Nazar-bi, adopted the title of Khan, building a fortress near where the Kazak river flows into the Aral Sea. After the Russian conquest of Khiva in 1873, when the Khan had to cede to Russia all his possessions east of the main arm of the Amu Darya and the most north-westerly arm of its delta, the land of the Karakalpak became Russian. The area, then separated from Khiva, was first administered as a separate department (odzyul), and later as part of the “government” of Sir Darya. On 11 May 1925 the Karakalpak Autonomous Oblast was formed as part of the Kazakh A.S.S.R.; on 20 March 1932 its status was changed to an Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (A.S.S.R.); and on 5 December 1936 this A.S.S.R. was transferred to the Uzbek S.S.R. The capital of the Karakalpak A.S.S.R. is Nukus. The Karakalpak, who at the time of the Revolution were on the verge of being totally assimilated by the Kazakh (and to a lesser extent by the Uzbek), were preserved as a distinct group by the Soviet regime. Linguistically the Karakalpak language is merely adialect of Kazakh; their tribal divisions are the same as that of the Kazak. Karakalpak was first written (i.e., established as a literary language) in 1925 using the Arabic script; in 1928 this was changed to a Latin script; and since 1940 it has been written in Cyrillic. The 1970 Soviet census lists 326,009 Karakalpak in the U.S.S.R. Of these 230,258 (97.6%) live in the Uzbek S.S.R.; of these latter, 217,505 (92.2% of the total Soviet Karakalpak population) live in the Karakalpak A.S.S.R., 8,008 in Bukhara Oblast, 143 in Tashkent, and 73 in Farghāna Oblast (the Farghāna Karakalpak are rapidly being assimilated by the Uzbek).

Bibliography: Vambéry, Das Türkenvolk in seinen ethnologischen und ethnographischen Beziehungen, Leipzig 1885, 373; S. A. Tokarev, Etnografiya Narodov S.S.S.R., Moscow Univ., 1938; Narodli Srednye Azii i Kazakhstana, Academy of Sciences, Moscow 1962, i. For their language: K. H. Menges, in PtTF, i, 434-88 (bibl. at p. 438), and cf. ii, 762. (W. BARKHOLD [R. WIXMAN])

KARAKAY. The cross-reference to 1929 from CARUCUEL is erroneous; see KARA-KOL, KARAULU.

KARAULOK, modern Turkish term for “police-station”, “[military] patrol”, a popular etymology ("black [i.e., ominous] arm [of the authorities] or "patrol"); for Ottoman karagül, karevül, a loanword from Mongol (attested from the 8th/14th century), see Tarama sütülg, Ankara 1969, iv, 2283 ff. The Mongol word also passed into Persian as kerdun/kardul. For full references and details of the diffusion of the word (as far as Swahili), see Doerfer, i, no. 276.

In the Ottoman Empire the maintenance of security and order in different quarters of Istanbul was entrusted mainly to the Janissaries [see YENIČERI], and the orias (companies) patrolling the city were called kellülük. During the military campaigns, apart from the Tarıkahs (vanguard) forces, the Ottoman army used to send out small units called karavul or karevul. In the same way the Ottoman navy, when at sea, sent out two mail ships as karavul or karsevler, with the task of preventing any sudden attack on the fleet. About ten ships under the command of the tersâne kılıũluğçu (Intendant of the Admiralty) brought up the rear as ard karavul to help ships in trouble when necessary.

After the suppression of the Janissaries in 1826, public security in Istanbul became the responsibility of the serâşher [q.v.]; an autonomous administration, the Davetiye Müdafiiyeti, which was founded in 1846 to take charge of police functions, was changed into a nişâret (ministry) in 1870 and in 1899 attached to the Ministry of the Interior as a directorate with authority extending over the whole country [see TARÎH]. At that time, a police-station was called karakol-khâne, and later karakol. The word karakol was used also in the Turkish army and navy to designate a unit charged with security or observation duty (istiinād karakol, ister karakol, nişâp karakol, etc.).

garded as a part of the Karakorum. This idea was first put forward by Klaproth in 1836 and was held by Burarrd, Sven Hedin and others who further regarded the Trans-Himalaya as belonging to the Karakorum system. If this is accurate, the whole system would be about 2,000 km. long.

The highest elevations are found in the part west of the pass of Karakorum. There we find several peaks over 8,000 m. high and countless summits over 7,000 m. The highest peak—probably the second highest in the world—is K2, which seems to have been long known as Chogo-ri among the natives. This giant attains a height of 8,611 m.

This western part of the Karakorum possesses a wild and imposing natural beauty; a large part of is covered with perpetual snows over a considerable extent. The snow line runs from 4,770 m. north of the principal chain to 5,203 m. in the south. The inhabitants are Baltis, a mixed people with Tibetan language, Ladhakis, who are Tibetans, and Hunzas.

If we exclude the polar regions, the largest glaciers in the world are found in this part of the Karakorum. The Siachen glacier is 68 km. long and covers a surface of about 2,500 sq. km. The Baltoro, Hispara and Biafo glaciers are only a little less than the Siachen. The plateau out of which rises the Karakoram has an average height of 3,070 m. The whole region is excessively dry because the rain (snow, hail) falls almost exclusively on the high mountains. The vegetation in the valleys is very slight and is confined to the vicinity of torrents and streams. At the terminations of the glaciers we find—very often on a little plain—a very beautiful alpine flora.

The Karakorum is the most important watershed in Central Asia, dividing the rivers which running northwards, empty their waters into the deserts of this part of the world, and those running southwards into the Indian Ocean.

The principal pass is the col of Karakorum (5,571 m.), through which runs the important trade route between Chinese Turkestan and Kashmir. It is difficult to describe; dangerous. In their long journey countless beasts of burden perish of exhaustion or in the avalanches. The mountains take their name from the pass. But as Karakorum means "black dobris", the name is not very appropriate. It is found for the first time in a map by Elphinstone published in 1815. On this map the range in question is indicated by the name Moor Taugh (instead of Mur Tagh, "Ice Mountain") or Karakorumri Mountain.

The first traveller to write on the mountains now called Karakorum was Mirza Haydar Dughlat, a propos of his journey from Yarkand to Leh, capital of Ladakh, in 160/1558. The exploration proper of the Karakorum only began in 1808 when Elphinstone visited these regions. The more systematic and detailed exploration of the high mountains proper was only begun in 1892 by Mr. Martin Conway's expedition, which was followed by many others (including 5 expeditions of Ph. C. and J. Visser between 1922 and 1935).


(Ph. C. Visser-II. Spuler)

Karakorum, a town in the aymak of Övör Khangay in Central Mongolia, now in ruins; in the 17th century it was for a short time the capital of the Mongol World Empire. The fullest accounts of the town are given by the European traveller William of Rubruck and the Persian historian Djiwaynî [q.v.]. The ruins were first discovered in 1889 by N. M. Yadrentsev; they were visited and described by the members of the Russian expedition of 1891 led by Radlov; and in 1948-49 an expedition jointly organized by the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic investigated the palace of the Great Khan Ögedey, the handicraft workshops at the crossroads of the main thoroughfares of Karakorum and some places near the southern gate of the town. Though walled by Ögedey only in 1235, Karakorum had been chosen by Chingiz-Khan as his capital as early as 1220. The name, which is Turkish and means "black boulder", was, as Djiwaynî expressly remarks, originally applied to the mountain region around the sources of the Orkhon. According to William of Rubruck, the city of Karakorum, exclusive of Ögedey's palace, was "not as big as the village of Saint Denis", while the monastery of Saint Denis was "ten times larger than the palace". There was, however, much building in Karakorum during its brief period of splendour, and William of Rubruck as well as Djiwaynî give full descriptions of the imperial palaces built in the city and around it, some by Chinese and others by Muslim architects. According to the European traveller, Russian and Western European craftsmen also shared in these operations. To the east of Karakorum, in a village called Taqghu-Balikh (from the Turkish taqghu, "offering of food to an elephant", and balikh "town") built in 1238, there was a palace with the Chinese name of Ying chin tien ("Welcome Carriage Hall").

After the Mongol emperors had removed their residence to China, Karakorum was only the seat of the governor of Mongolia. It changed hands temporarily during the long war with Kaydu, but generally remained in the possession of the emperor. When the Mongol dynasty was expelled from China (1368), the emperors returned to Karakorum, but after the extinction of the dynasty in the 15th
perhaps less of a defeat for the Ottoman Empire than has been commonly accepted, and the Ottomans were able to withdraw from a disastrous war with their pride, if not their territories, intact. Within governing circles of the Empire the settlement nonetheless was to generate considerable opposition, particularly from military elements, and it is probably in these internal repercussions, leading up to the Edirne Incident of 1151/1730, as much as in the actual territorial adjustments, that its significance lies.

Röthig, J. W. Ewlylā Çelebī, Seyyidname, vii (Istanbul 1928), 144-5. Mehmed Râşîd, Ta’rîh-i (Istanbul 1828), ii, 415-74 (texts of treaties at pp. 449-73; western-language versions were published in Flugschriften soon after the conclusion of the congress, in Vienna, Venice and elsewhere; cf. also R. Knolles, The General Historie of the Turkes, iii, London 1700, ad finem, for the first English edition of the treaties). For important Ottoman works still in MS. form, cf. the references given in the article by I. Parmaksızoğlu, s.v. Karlova, in A. The article by J. von Hammer, GOR, vi ( Pest, 1828), 466-78, is based in part on these, and is still useful on that account. The studies on the Congress of Carlowitz by Popovec (1893) and Munsen (1940) are now superseded; the results of recent research by R. A. Abou-El-Haj are to be found in his unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Princeton 1963) and in articles in JAOS, ix (1969) and xixi (1964), and Islam, li (1974).

(K. J. H. Wood)

KARLUK, early Arabic form Khâlîkh, Persian Khâllîkh (whence frequent confusion in the sources with the Khalâd [q.v.], Chinese Ko-lo-lo (northwestern Middle Chinese *Kâ-lâ-luk), a Turkish tribal group in Central Asia. They were originally a small federation of three tribes (whence the name given to them in the Uyghur Shine-usu inscription ca. 750 of Ue Karluk; the Hôddâd-i-i system, 98, on the other hand, mentions seven tribes of the Karluks), and comparatively unimportant. Their paramount chief never bore the title of khâghan or khan, but in the 7th and 8th centuries had that of ûteber (perhaps "possessor of a land or people"), one of only moderate rank (see A. Bombaci, On the ancient Turkic title Elüba, in Proceedings of the Xth meeting of the Permanent International Alatistic Conference, Naples 1970, 24, 578), and Kâshgharî does not mention them amongst the twenty Turkish tribes listed in the introduction of the Dîwân lâshôt-i外壳 (tr. Atalay, i, 28). Kâshghari does, however, mention the Karluk in connection with certain Turkish words or phrases, and defines them as a nomadic tribe, distinct from the Oguz, but, like them, counted as Turkmen (tr. i, 473, cf. Barthold, Four studies on the history of Central Asia, iii, A history of the Turkman people, 78). Our first information on the Karluks comes from Chinese sources, which mention them as having been subjugated by the Western T'uchieh or Turks ca. 640-50. At this time they were a pastoralist people located on the upper reaches of the Irtish River and north of the Tien Shan. In the early years of the 8th century they passed under the control of the Eastern T'uchieh empire, and the Orkton inscriptions mention the rebellion of the Karluks against the Khâghân in 711-14 (see Sir G. von Clausen and F. W. Trümmler, The inscription at Khote Khuchut, in RO, xxxivii (1974), 27-8, 29). The Karluks took part with the Basmill and Uyghur in the general upheaval which brought about the disintegration of the Eastern T'uchieh empire (741-5), but were in turn defeated by the Uyghur and compelled to move westwards to wards Transoxania (on all these events, see E. Chavannes, Documents sur les T'ou-hieh (Turcs) Occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1900; Liu Mau-ts'ai, Die chinesischen Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'uhuieh), Wiesbaden 1938; L. N. Gumilev, Drevnie Tyuruki, Moscow 1957; J. R. Hamilton, Les Quotils à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties, Paris 1937). They now came within the orbit of Muslim writers. According to Işâqî, 290, the boundary between the Karluks and the Oğuz was the region of Işfâdâb on the middle Syr Darya, and the Hûddâd-i-i system (372/982), 97, cf. Map v, 279, places them south of the Issik-Kül, i.e., on the southern fringes of the Semi-reyê. Their ruler now appears in Muslim sources with the title of yâbghû (Arabic form dâbghûyâ, probably reflecting a western Turkish dialectical pronunciation of the word), adopted equally by the chief of the Oğuz [see Çûuz]. There were also Karluks who had penetrated southwards into the upper Oxus basin and Tûkhrâstân, where Arabic sources mention them in connection with the Arab campaigns against the epigoni of the Hephthalites in this region; the prince of the Karluks here also bore the title of yâbghû.

These Karluks on the northern fringes of Transoxania were long a refuge for political and religious dissidents and refugees fleeing before the Arab advance into Central Asia; thus the Yâbghû, together with the local Sogdians and the ruler of Tibet, supported the rebellious Arab governor in Samarqand, Râfî b. Layyû, against the Caliph Harûn al-Rashîd. Such contacts, however, probably disposed the Karluks to reception of the Islamic faith and culture, whereas the more westerly Oghûz remained at a perceptibly lower cultural level. The campaign of the Sâmânîd Amîr Isâmî b. Ahmad [q.v.] against Tâlas in 280/893 struck into the heart of their lands, and commercial and religious penetration must have followed; the geographers of the 4th/10th century mention the existence of mosques in several towns east of Tâlas. The comparatively advanced state of the Karluks at this time is reflected in the statement of the Hûddâd-i-i system that they were a pleasant-natured people, near to civilized folk in their living standards; the same source describes their settlements in the southern part of the Semi-reyê where some of the Karluks practiced agriculture and whiter merchants resorted (97-8, 256 f.).

The royal family of the Kara-khânides, who put an end to the Sâmânîd amirate in Transoxania at the close of the 4th/10th century and divided its lands with the Ghaznavids, may conceivably have sprung from the Karluks (this thesis is maintained by O. Pritsak, Von den Karluks zu den Karachaniden, in ZDMG, ci (1951), 290-300); but equally likely candidates are such groups as the Çîgi, Yâghma, Tûrgesh, etc., and it is strange that Kâshghari, who sprang from the Kara-khânid milieu, does not mention a Karluks origin for the dynasty [see İLEK-KHÂNS]. Some Karluks tribesmen certainly remained as a nomadic tribal group within the Kara-khânid dominions, for in the 6th/12th century we hear of tension between them and the Karâkhânî khanûns; it was the pretext of help for the Karluks at odds with Çâghrî Khan of Samarqand which enabled the Khâghân Shâh II Arslân to invade Transoxania in 553/1158 (see Diwawain-Boyle, i, 268-9; Bosworth, in Cambridge history of Iran, v, 148-9, 157-8).

At the opening of the 7th/13th century there were Karluks rulers in the region to the north of the Ili River and eastwards from their earlier centre in the southern Semi-reyê, e.g., in Almaalâgh and Kayalâgh,
where these Khâns were under the suzerainty of the Kara Khâns [q.v.].) (2) Umayyad-Boyle, i, 74-5; Barthold, Four Studies, i, History of the Semirechye, 103-4. Karluk tribal contingents joined the army of Çingiz-Khan in 616/1219 and took part in the siege of Transoxiana, but after the Mongol period, the name of the Karluk becomes less frequent in the history of Central Asia, with ever disappearing completely. Thus the Târîh-i Raghi of Mirzâ Muhammad Haydar Dughlat, ll, Elias and Ross, 309, mentions a commander (sîdarî) of the Karluk tribe in Transoxiana involved in warfare of the early 15th century. At the present time, various Turkish groups of northeastern Afghanistan, in the regions of Badakhshan and Kattaghan, call themselves Kalo or Karluk; see G. Jarring, On the distribution of Turk tribes in Afghanistan, an attempt at a preliminary classification, in Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. xxxiv (Lund-Leningrad 1939), 71-3 and index.

Bibliography: In addition to works cited above, see Barthold, Turkistan down to the Mongol invasion, index; idem, Histoire des Turcs d’Asie Centrale, chs. iii-iv; Bosworth, The Turks in the Islamic lands up to the mid-12th century, in PTF, iii, Wiesbaden 1970; IA art. Karluklar (Rahmeti Arat). The information of the Islamic geographers is utilized in Minorsky’s copious commentary to the section on the Karluk in Ḥudud al-Samā‘, 97-8, 286-97.

(C. E. Bosworth)

KARM (A.), the vine. Toome who knows the official attitude of Islam towards wine see [KARM], the vitality of the cultivation of the vine in the majority of non-Muslim Muslim countries is agronomically paradoxical. Nevertheless, it is incontestable, and is explained by the force of tradition in some countries where the vine has long been established, by the multiple uses of the grape (fresh fruit, dried raisin, vinegar, pharmaceutical uses, the lees as fertilizer, etc.), by the survival of non-Muslim communities, and also by the laxity of many Muslims themselves. This vitality is attested in particular, perhaps due to the written tradition, by the very considerable and exceptional place that the Muslim agronomists accord to the vine in comparison to other species studied, from the easterner Ibn Wahhsiyya or the Calendar of Cordova to the Andalusians of the 9th/11th and the 6th/12th centuries, to whom we owe the essential part of that which will be summarized below.

Their knowledge resulted from the combination of the data of the ancient authors, rediscovered and assimilated (with, in Spain, Junius = Columella added to the sources known in the Orient) with the intensive day-to-day experience constantly renewed.

To sum up, this knowledge is difficult, since one of the principal characteristics of the cultivation methods described is the precision of their application and the multiplicity of the methods followed. Nevertheless, it appears generally that the vines cultivated, more numerous than in our days and transported by the Arabs from one end of their conquered lands to the other, did not remain stabilized and were the object of experiments of selection and acclimatization that we know particularly with regard to Spain (between the plain and the mountain, for example), but that were also tested in the East, where Ibn al-Fakhâr (BGA, 125) and the Persien agronomists of the Mongol period in particular preserve for us the names of various kinds of vines. The vegetative cycle of each vine-plant being different, the agronomists, applying the principle of the complementary nature of a defect and a quality (such as adaptation to dryness or humidity, etc.) mainly made use of the diversities of the climates and soils of the Mediterranean zone and the Near East.

Some systems of cultivation predominate in the Andalusian treatises: (a) The low vine, planted in holes or trenches (recommended, but little practiced) about 1.40 m. apart, supported or in low clumps, thinned out very little in order to protect the grape against the sun: a method of cultivation reserved for warm sites; (b) The climbing vine, classical in the Mediterranean region, where the creeper was used as support for the fruit trees with shallow roots, whose height had to be controlled so that they did not injure the vine; in contradiction to the ancients, the Andalusians rejected the intercalary cultivation that exhausts the vine, and especially the association of the vine and the fig-tree. The best soils were alluvial, humid, but not saturated, according to the westerners, and also sandy according to Ibn Wahhsiyya, but one might also make use of the rich soils for the species that derive nourishment easily; the principle of complementarity took the place of the modern idea of forced cultivation. The choice of sites was adapted to the vines’ wants; slopes and hill-sides for the low vines, valleys and plains for the climbing ones, mountains in order to test the quality of a vine-plant; it was banned from the marshlands, sources of the vine’s diseases. The preparatory work was a deep tillage with the spade, with trenches larger than the furrows of tillage in the earth of mediocre quality and holes for the good localities with a depth of at least 2 cubits (almost a metre) for protection against the sun. The surface work of the end of the first year was a loosening with the pruning knife to spare the roots, those nearest to the surface meanwhile being cut back to strengthen the deepest.

Reproduction in the nurseries was done in the form of taking cuttings, layering (tābîs) and sowing in a manner conforming to the practices of our days. The stratification was systematic. As for the shoots, cuttings and layered branches, it is often pointed out that they should not be planted together in the same hole, which proves that it was done. Most authors agree in recommending vinegar to preserve the young shoots, although the early species might be planted in autumn (hesitations that one would still encounter today); the Egyptian fiscal treatises speak of planting in February or March. The vinestocks, once tested for three years in very poor soil, they were transplanted in the vineyard chosen to receive them.

Well spread out fertilization was especially necessary in the planting and pruning, above all when vines were made to follow another vegetable insufficently treated with animal manure, usual in the Middle Ages; it was reduced to a powder, and, according to an Aristotelian principle, the ashes of the stems of the plant itself were preferred; this preference for dry fertilizer is a particularly modern aspect of Andalusian viticulture. Irrigation depended on the climate, the soil and the plant chosen; watering by hand was frequently carried out in order to proportion better the quantity of water needed to obtain really syrupy and not-too-full grapes.

Among the measures taken to increase the vine's productivity, pruning (ṣabr) was the principle practised in winter with the iron pruning knife (minjid) already described by Columella; the aim was to draw the sap towards the best developed wood. Grafting, already known to the ancients, was the subject of descriptions and experiments infinitely more varied among the Muslim agronomists. Everything was taken into consideration, form and colour of the
of the act of unveiling". Al-Qazâlî's famous distinction between 'utlâm al-mu'âšâma (ritual observances, social customs and ethical rules) and 'utlâm al-mu'âshâma, by means of which realities are apprehended, is well-known. The dîsîr, i.e., râhî, says that the 'âml al-mu'âshâma is the knowledge of what is concealed (bâhîf), and is the aim of all the sciences. It is the science of the names of the saints (sidîklân) and those "brought near to God". It is a light which shines into the heart if the latter is purified and freed from its reprehensible qualities, a light which bears upon God, His essence, His angels, His acts, the prophets and the future life (cf. ibid., i, 48). It is not argumentation, nor simple acceptance, but an intuitive and sure grasping of the subject. By 'âml al-mu'âshâma, we mean the pulling-aside of the veil so that the Real One shows Himself in all his splendour; and this is effected with a clarity which sets the object present right before the eyes, without any possible grounds for doubt" (i, 18; see other references in Jabre, op. cit., 216, and idem, La notion de certitude selon Ghazâlî, Paris 1958, index, s.v.). Mûshâfîfî and mukâshâfûf appear equally all through the Ikhâd. Hence for al-Qazâlî, kashîf is a light, a freely-bestowed grace from God, which at the same time alone bestows its quality of certain knowledge. In so far as the later 'âml al-kalâm was open to influences from al-Qazâlî (or directly from Sâfîsm), kashîf and mukâshâfûf were sometimes freely accepted; but the most classic treatises hardly ever refer to them.

3. Brief references in Shi'îsm. In Shi'îsm, the spiritual experience of kashîf inevitably came to form a theological (or "theosophical") dimension. The apprehension of the "hidden meaning" (bâhîf), which is the perfection of Islam and which is the prerogative of the great Imâmîs, led to a high value being placed on kashîf. To give only one significant example, the two treatises of the Imâmî Sayyid Haydar Âmûli, ed. Henry Corbin and Osman Yahya as La philosophie âshîie (Tehran-Paris 1969), deal with kashîf as a manner and a method of knowledge. The Dîsîr al-asrâr mentions it, after râhî (revelation, though angelic intermediary) and tilâm (divine, inner inspiration), as a participation stemming from the universal intellect and the universal soul (La philosophie âshîie, 448-53). When Âmûli defines kashîf (ibid., 462), it is in the same lexicographical and technical terms as were to be copied from him by al-Dîrîjânî, as already mentioned above. The ending of the chapter distinguishes, among other things, (a) kashîf swarî (the "imaginal" perception of reality) whose irradiations (lîdajîsîyîl) reach the senses of sight and hearing; mention is made in this connection of the master Ibn 'Arabî; and (b) kashîf mu'âshâfî, which is of the spiritual order (râhî); the text emphasises strongly mukâshâfûfî received in this fashion (ibid., 464-72). In his Risâla fi ma'rifat al-wudûdî, Âmûli enumerates three modes of knowledge: by the intellect (âshîi), by transmission (mâhî) and by kashîf (ibid., 632), and only the last one leads to the apprehension of Reality. Hence it is with some justification that, in regard to Haydar Âmûli, the phrase "the method of kashîf" has been used (cf. Peter Antes, Zur Theologie der Sehns, Freiburg 1971, 49, 68), this method being an intuitive one in which certainty is sought from spiritual illumination. Âmûli's admiration for Ibn 'Arabî and for the latter's deliberate scheme for "reconciling" the Sûfîs and the Imâmîs, is well-known. Âmûli's work was to influence all later

Twelvever theology, and is in fact the applying of the Sûfî kashîf to the Shi'î search for the hidden meanings of things. If we bear in mind that his definition of kashîf was adopted as it stood by the Sunnî al-Dîrîjânî, we can accordingly discern, despite the divergencies of various climates of thought, a continuity of viewpoint.

Ismâ'îlî writings put the accent on the idea of the "state" of kashîf from a double point of view, both gnostic and cosmic. The title chosen by al-Hasjî in the 5th/11th century, Kâshîf al-mahjûb, designates equally the 8th/14th century treatise of the Ismâ'îlî scholar Abû Ya'qûb al-Sîjîjânî, and kashîf now introduces an ontology and cosmology of gnostic type. Furthermore, the classic opposition or mukâshâfûfî of kashîf-satr is frequently found, this time set forth according to wide cosmic perspectives, in the Ismâ'îlî cycles of metaphysics. The aevum of "proto-history" (Corbin) and of post-history are unfolded according to alternate phases of "unveiling" ("epiphany"), as tr. Corbin) and "occupation". The length of these cycles may vary, and may refer indifferently to the "premonbial Adam" (the "Perfect Man"), to the "partial Adam" (the Qur'anic Adam) or to the "spiritual Adam" for the intelligible realities. According to al-Ijúsu y b. ʿ Ali, a Yemeni dâ'î of the 6th/12th century, the cycle of unveiling (dawâr al-kashîf) is 50,000 years, and the cycle of occupation (dawâr al-satr) is seven millennia. The present age, since the creation of the "partial Adam", is the fourth millennium of a cycle of occupation, which has been preceeded and will be succeeded by a cycle of unveiling (cf. al-Ijúsu y b. ʿ Ali, Risâlā al-mabâdî wa l-maʿâdî, ed. and Fr. tr. Corbin, Trologie ismatiensiennes, Tehran-Paris 1961, 121-3/181-3).

An exhaustive study of kashîf in Shi'î thought—Imâmî and Ismâ'îlî—would in fact require an extensive exposition.

**Bibliography:** given in the article.

(L. GARDET)

KÂSHÎGHAR, a town in Chinese Turkestan (Sin Siang); the same name is still used in Chinese official documents. The name Kâshîghar first appears in Chinese transcription (K'iu-ch'a) in the P'ang-shu; cf. E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-Kinois* (Turco occidentaux, St. Petersburg 1903, 121 f. On the pre-Islamic Kâshîghar and the ruins of Buddhist buildings in the vicinity, see A. Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, Oxford 1907, i, 52 f.; idem, *Serindia*, Oxford 1921, 80 f. Arab armies did not reach Kâshîghar; the story of Kutayba's campaign in 96/715 is, as shown by H. A. R. Gibb in *BSOS*, ii (1923), 467-8, a mere legend. Since ca. 132/750, Kâshîghar was under Karakûl rule and turkized by them. On the flight of a prince of Farghâna to Kâshîghar in the time of the Caliph al-Manṣūr (356-58/954-75) see the article FARGHANA. In the Sâmânî period a Dâkhîa of Kâshîghar with the name or title Tughân Tîgin is mentioned (Ibn al-Athîr, viii, 37), with whom the rebel prince Iyâs b. Ishâk took refuge; whether this Dîkho had already adopted Islam is not mentioned. At a later date Satîbu Boghâr Khân is mentioned as the first Muslim Khân of Kâshîghar; in the oldest reference to him that we have (Dâmâl Kûrâshi in Barthold, *Turkestan*, 255, 257) the date of his death is given as 344/955-6. This story already contains features which are certainly legendary; in the story of the building of the first mosque we have the well-known folklore motif of the cutting of an ox-skin into strips. The later legend, reproduced by F. Grenard (*J.A*, Ser. 9, vol. xv, 1 f.), has not this feature but
contains many other legendary traits and abo
solutely false dates. The year 344 A.H. is perhaps
too early, as probably the story of the adoption of
Islam by a numerous Turkish last of Turkestan 200,000 tents
in 343/956 must be referred to the Turks of Kásaghär;
this story is found not only in Ibn al-Aqīl (vii, 290)
but also in Ibn Miskawayh (The Eclipse of the Ab-
basid Caliphate, ed. Margoliouth and Amedro,
Oxford 1921, text, ii, 181, tr. v, 196); the original
source is probably Thābit b. Sīnān al-Sāhibi (cf.
Ibn al-Aqīl, viii, 476, 491; The Eclipse etc. Index).
The tomb of Sātuq Bghār Khán is in Artuq (now
pronounced Artuq) north of Kásaghär, where it
is still shown.
Under the rule of the Ilīg-Khán (see ilīg-khāns),
who confessed Islam since ca. 950, Kásaghär was
politically the most important town in the Turım
basin; perhaps it was also the most important from
the point of view of culture. In the 5th/6th century
there was already in existence a work in Arabic on the
history of the town, composed by Abu 'l-Putāb
Abīl-Ghaffar (or 'Abd al-Ghaffār) b. Husayn al-
Almā'ī al-Kadżgharī (sic); the author's father,
who survived his son (according to al-Samā'ī by
about ten years), died in 486/1093. On father and
son and the works of the latter, see al-Samā'ī,
Kitāb al-Ansāb, ed. Margoliouth, Leiden-London
1912, II, 470a, 472a; Dīmālāl Kūrāshī in Barthold,
Turkestān, i, 123 f. The rulers—since 1310 under
the overlordship of the Karakhtaş—were in a
special mutual society (Arabic al-Qumadda al-shāhā-
niya) on the bank of the Tūmen; the first prince
buried there died in Muharram 42/Dec. 7 1032-
Jan. 5 1033, and the last in Rashīd 652/29 Feb.-
23 March 1205. During their rule, Māmüd al-Kás-
aghāri (q.v.) wrote his great Turkish dictionary in
Bagdad, and Yusuf Khāṣh Hadjiç his Kutdāng bilig
in Kásaghär. During Mongol rule a madrasa
was built in Kásaghär by Mas'ud Beğ (see musīd-khās);
its library was the copy of the Şīhāb al-Dījār
used by Dīmālāl Kūrāshī for his translation (F.
Schau and Eith, Cat. of the Persian...Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, Oxford 1889, col. 983).
Kásaghär was later under the rule of the Dughlāt
Aqlīs (see ilīg-khāns); and the federative union led to its
reigned till 920/1534, according to the statement
of his royal Háyyar Mirzā (q.v.) for forty-eight
years (Mirzā Háyyar Dughlāt, Tāvīkī-i Rekādī; tr.
F. Denison Ross, London 1895, 253, 326); but
this is contradicted by the author himself, who
says that Kásaghār was not conquered by Abū Bakr
till 885/1480-1. Abū Bakr is the founder of the
central town. He destroyed the old fortress and in
the last years of his reign rebuilt it on a new site, on
the other side of the Tūmen on the tongue of land
between the streams and the Kfīl Sā (ibid., 286-7, 295).
Under the rule of the "Mongol" Khāns (cf. the
Bibliography to čahātāv-khāns) and later under
that of the Kalmúcks and Chinese (since 1759)
the capital of the district was no longer Kásaghār
but Yärkán. It was only so since the reconquest of
the country by the Chinese in 1877 that Kásaghār
again attained considerable importance as the
residence of the Tao-P'āi, who was over the western
and southern part of Turkestan as far
as the oasis of Čérén, and as the one-time residence
of the Russian and English consuls. On Kásaghār
in 1873 see H. W. Bellaw in Sir T. D. Forsyth,
Mission to Yärkán in 1873, London 1875. On condi-
tions at the turn of the present century, see
especially L. Korniłow, Kásaghāri, Taşkent
1903 (review by Barthold, in Zapiski vost. obšč.,
xv, 131 f.) with plan of Kásaghār on p. 208,
and M. Hartmann, Chinesisch-Türkistan, Halle
a/S. 1908, especially 45 f., 80 f., with a plan of
the town from Korniłow. The most important building
in Kásaghār and vicinity is Háhrat Apāk, the
tomb of the famous wali of the 11th/12th century.
Kásaghār has now approximately 70,000 inhabitants
(mostly Sunni Uyghur Turks).

Bibliography: Iqtedār al-Şāyān, 96 (§ 131),
280 f.; Yāqūt, ed. Beirit (1957), iv, 439 f.; Hand
Allah Mustawfi, Nuzhat al-khulās, 225; Barthold,
Turkestān, index; B. Spuler, Iran, index; idem,
Geschichte Mittelasiens, Leiden 1966, index;
A. Schulte, in Mitteilungen aus dem Seminar für
Geographie der Univ. Hamburg, 1921.
(W. Barthold [B. Spuler])
Turkish spoken in Kâşgâhr, which he terms Kâşkând Türkû. Kâshghârî’s work is related essentially to Karakânîd linguistic records. Aside from the material on Kâshghâr, the linguistic data from the Ögûkh and Kîpçeül are of considerable value. The dictionary was originally designed as a language-manual for scholars in Bâghdâd who had some contact with Türkî peoples. Hence he deliberately adopted the methods of Arabic grammar and lexicography in describing his linguistic material. While Arabic grammar served, to some extent, as a guideline, the product of Arabic lexicographic literature also furnished him with a complete entry-word list, a sort of lexicographic questionnaire, with which he confronted the Türkû word-stock, his own mother-tongue. It is highly probable that this starting point considerably enlarged the word-stock in his work. The fact that the Türkî linguistic material had to be fitted into the categories of Arabic grammar certainly impelled Kâshghârî carefully to study his material. Yet the fact that the work was prepared in Bâghdâd—at a great distance from the homeland of the Türkî peoples—made him unable to comprehend and control his linguistic material to the fullest extent; and it is open to question how far he grasped those modest opportunities for such control which were probably available in Bâghdâd. Also questionable is the extent to which the assumed—repeated re-dactions of the work enhanced or diminished the authenticity of the linguistic material. Since we do not possess the autograph manuscript of the work and the copyist was not a Türk, the relation of the copy to the original raises similar questions.

Kâshghârî’s dictionary pays particular attention to place names, tribal names, proper names, ranks and titles. Explanatory notes in the work include historical data and personal experiences as well as specimens of Türkî folklore, verses, proverbs, etc., which make the work an important source for these last, which are of particular significance as coherent Türkî texts, in addition to their historical-folkloristic value. Kâshghârî’s comparative remarks are also highly instructive, though his material is less rich in this respect. The elements in the author’s mother-tongue included in his work should be regarded as a record of the standard usage of local scholars, for, as we have noted, Kâshghârî’s main aim was to make Arab scholars acquainted with the Türkî languages. He rightly regarded his mother-tongue as one representative idiom of this language-group. At the same time, and understandably enough, he refused to include those Arabic loan-words which he considered irrelevant in this context. However, those words already played an important role in the Kûtadghû bilig, the most significant literary monument of the period, and it seems highly probable that they had also found their way into the spoken language. One major merit of Kâshghârî’s work, however, lies precisely in the fact that he tends to focus his attention on the word-stock of the “everyday” spoken Türkû languages. His dictionary thus complements our knowledge of the Karakânîd language, obtained mainly from the Kûtadghû bilig.

Although Kâshghârî’s knowledge of the difference between the individual Türkû languages moves within certain objective bounds and his remarks are sometimes contradictory, he must be given credit for using the comparative approach to the full in his work. His main concern is with the language of Kâshghâr, the Ögûkh and Kîpçeül areas; he established, as fact the separation of these two language groups, and the related data may well be considered as the first surviving evidence of this. In the case of certain extinct Türkû languages without any written record, his data are their only documentation.

Though in evaluating Kâshghârî’s facts and data, certain errors (the background of the manuscript, the author’s knowledge, etc.) must always be taken into account, comparative linguistic folkloric, historical and geographic studies have often emphasized the particular value of the work as a source. His dictionary is a product of the intellectual sphere of the early Arab-Türkî symbiosis, when the methods of Arab linguistics were applied to the material of Türkû languages, which until then had been barely documented, thus creating a source of unprecedented value to comparative and historical linguistics and to the study of the history of the Türkî peoples in this period. As well as contributing greatly to the extension of our knowledge of the early Türkû word-stock and of the various Türkû languages, the work is also a valuable guideline in the chronology of the early Türkû records, the majority of which are chronologically uncertain Uyghûr texts. Like the other Karakânîd linguistic records, Kâshghârî’s dictionary is classified chronologically as Mûddle Türkû—a term deriving from the practical classification of the Common Türkû linguistic monuments—on the basis of its chronological place between the runic inscriptions, the early Uyghûr texts and the later Türkû linguistic records.


(G. Haza)

KâSHI, a Persian word designating the tiles or trimmed pieces of faience serving to cover completely or partially the main fabric of buildings in a design principally decorative but also, at times, to protect them against humidity. This term, which also exists in Turkish, is an abbreviation of Kâşgân; the town of Kâşgân [q.v.] was in effect the most important and most famous centre of production in Iran. It seems likely in Abrâhîm Kâshgari's Faience treated dedicated to this subject (s. 700ff), in the form kâshî-gari, which means literally "the art of making kâshî", but for this author it had a wider sense and designated the art of faience. (See J. W. Allan, Abrâhîm Kâşgharî's Treatise on ceramics in Iran, xi (1973), 111-20. In the Arab authors this term becomes kâşî (Yaḳût, iv, 15) or Kâşghânî (Yaḳût, ibid.; Ibn Bâṭlin, i, 415, 463, ii, 130, 225, 297, iii, 79).

The origin of the kâshî is linked with the techniques of pottery and with that of baked brick. So it has connections with a very ancient art. The excavations of Çughâ-Zanbil (Khûštân) have brought to light several types of tiled piles (13th century B.C.). (See P. Amiet, Elam, Paris 1966, pl. 261). There have also been discovered (ibid., pl. 383-92) some polychrome-coated tiles with plant decoration at Susa (2nd half of the 7th and 7 th centuries B.C.). The famous Friizione der Archers (Louvre, 5th century B.C.) is a well-known example of the enameled brick of the Achaemenids (M. Rutten, Les arts du Moyen Orient ancien, Paris 1963, pl. xxx) that the Assyrians and Babylonians also knew about (Assyrian Palace of Khorsabad, 722-705 B.C.; Gate of Ishtar at Babylon 6th century B.C.). Later on, in the period of the Parthians and Sasánids, this art experienced a certain decline and appears to be represented only by mosaics (Bîshapur, 2nd half of the 3rd century, see R. Ghirshman, Parthes et Sassanides, Paris 1962, pls. 186-6). Moreover, it is this technique which prevailed at the beginning of the Muslim period and the mosaics of this era are of Hellenistic or Byzantine inspiration. They were also much used for floors (rest room of the palace of Khirbat al-Mafjar; and D. and J. Sourdel, La civilisation de l'Islam classique, Paris 1968, pl. 124), as well as on the walls (Dome of the Rock, dated 691, above, art. ARCHITECTURE, pls. IV-VI; Great Mosque of Damascus, dated 775, Sourdel, pp. 94, pl. iv), but the use of kâshî in the form which later spread seems to emerge in the 5th/6th century. One of the first examples of its tentative appearance is to be found at the top of the minaret of the masjîd-i dîvânî of Dâmghân (2nd half of the 5th/6th century C., Calif and A. M. Melikian Chirvani, Les Monuments du xiv s. du Dâmghân, in Studia Iranica, i1 (1972), pl. xxvii). The enamel was also adopted, according to A. Godard, L'Art de l'Iran, Paris 1965, 366, to render the characters of the inscription more visible, i.e. more legible, on the exterior of buildings (cf. also ibid., pl. 132; M. B. Smith, The Manûrs of Iṣâfân, in AF, 1936/2, fig. 212). Approximately at the same period points of turquoise blue enamel appeared on buildings (Gonbad-i Surgh, dated 1147 at Maragha, A. U. Pope, A Survey of Persian Art, repr. Tokyo 1964, vii, pl. 341). This new type of insertion of quite small enamelled tablets drew its inspiration from the embossed joints of plaster which are already in existence on the buildings of the 5th/6th century. The arrangement of these small tablets then developed without interruption and various decorative schemes were adopted (funerary tower of Mu'mina Khathân, dated 1186, at Najafdhavan, ibid., pl. 345; Gür-i Amir, dated 1405, at Samarkand, ibid., ix, pls. 341-3). Emanating from these first productions, two techniques saw the light of day: that of the faience mosaic or kâshî-yi mu'arrak-kârî, and that of the faience tile or kâshî-kârî.

Kâshî-yi mu'arrak-kârî (or simply mu'arrak-kârî): this technique consists of cutting, according to precise forms, pieces of monochrome kâshî of different colours to compose a polychrome design (technique described by Godard, op. cit., pl. 187-9; H. F. Wace, The traditional crafts of Persia, Cambridge Mass., 1966, 121-5, figs. 188-94; Pope, op. cit., pl. 546). One of the
KAAYYM NASSIRI (1821-1902), born in the village of Yukan Shahdan in the canton of Sviazk in the government of Kazan, was one of the first and greatest modernist reformers amongst the Tatars of the Volga. After studying at the madrass of Kâzân, where he learned Arabic, Persian and Russian, Nâsirî founded at Kazan his own school where, for the first time, such secular subjects as history, arithmetic, geography and Russian language were taught—these being at this time novelties and innovations which bordered on heresy.

Kaayym Nasiri wrote over 50 works in Tatar, Turkish, Arabic and Persian; as the possessor of an encyclopaedic mind, he combined the skills of the philologist, folklorist, historian, geographer and ethnologist. His supreme merit was to have created a Tatar literary language, based on the dialect spoken in Kazan, which replaced the Çağhatay or Eastern Turkish previously used by Tatar writers and which now permitted the extraordinary flowering of Tatar literature towards the end of the 16th century. His most famous works are the Fêvükûl ul-dîjâsî (Kâzân 1884), the Emniçefî (Kâzân 1895, on the syntax of the Tatar language), the Lehe-i tâtârî (Kâzân 1895-6, 2 vols.) and above all, his famous Kâzân kâlisüdârî, an annual publication which appeared from 1870 to 1897 and which represents the best source of information on the origins of taqadd reformism amongst the Muslims of the Russian empire.

In Russian language, his two basic works are Obrastz naurodnyliteraturi Kasanskih Tatar ("Examples of the popular literature of the Tatars of Kazan"), in collaboration with N. F. Katanov, in Investiga Obshchestva Arkheologii, Istori i Etnografii, xiüî (Kâzân 1886), 374-427, and Pover'a i Obryadi Kasanskih Tatar obrovaznovishy pomiona Vliyanâ na nikk suvitkog Magoñetanast ("The beliefs and rites of the Tatars of Kazan formed outside the influence of Sunni Islam"), in Zapiski Imperatorskog Rossko Geograficheskogo Obshchestva, vi (Moscow 1880), 243-70.

Bibliography: There have been numerous books and articles dealing with Kaayym Nasiri in Kâzân Tatar, Turkish, Russian and French. In Russian, the most important is Kâzân Nâsirî (1821-1945). Materiały nauçovnî secssi posuyvchɛnîny 120 letosj 200 roks ("Materials of the scientific session devoted to the 200th anniversary of his birth"), Acad. of Sciences, Kâzân Division, Kâzân 1948, pp. 136 (also published in Tatar). In Turkish, there is the important study of Sanedt Ççaçatay, Abî-ul-Kâzâmî Nasîrî, in AÜDTGF, v/3-4 (Ankara 1952), 147-60. Finally, in French there is Ch. Lemerrier-Quejquevay, Un reformateur Tatar du XIX siècle, 'Abdul Qayyum al-Nâsirî, in Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique, iv/2-3 (Paris 1962), 177-42 (with a complete bibliography).

KAZAK [see KAZA].

KAZAK. The word kazak in the Turkic language can first be documented in the 8th/14th century in the meaning "independent; vagabond". These and similar meanings, such as "free and independent man, vagabond, adventurer, etc." are known in the modern Turkic languages too. During the tumults under the Timurids, the word signified the pretenders in contrast to the actual rulers, and also their supporters, who led the life of an adventurer or a robber at the head of their men. At the same time, the word began also to be applied to nomad groups which separated from their prince and kinsmen and so came into conflict with the state; later it had also the meaning "nomad", in contrast to the sedentary Sârî population in Central Asia. The status of kazak is also regarded as a very old social institution of the nomad Turkic peoples. The word became the name of a political unit and later an ethnic designation by having been applied to the meanings to those groups of the Uzbek tribal confederacy that had abandoned the Khân Abu'l-Khayr and migrated to the north-east steppes of Turkistan. These ethnic groups formed the core of the population of the present Kazakh (Kazakhstan), retaining later this name. However, it is probable that other Turkic, and probably Mongol, elements were also involved in the ethnogenesis of the modern Kazak people. The struggles with the Kalmyks in the 18th/19th century forced the three Kazak hordes to make an approach to Russia and to accept the Russian supremacy. Until the beginning of the 20th century, this took the form of a very close connection. According to the former Russian tradition, i.e., to distinguish the Turkish Kazaks from the Slavic Kazaks or Kozaks (Cossacks), the Kazaks in Central Asia were also called Kazak-Kirghiz in learned and correct parlance. The word kazak—borrowed from the Turkish languages—appears in the Russian linguistic records first at the end of the 14th century with a wide range of meanings. The military meaning came later into predominance by applying the word to those military groups which played an eminent role in medieval Russian history. The form kosak (Cossack) used in western European languages goes back to the Ukrainian and Polish pronunciations. No certain etymology of the word kazak has yet been given. The generally known inner-Turkic etymology, from ka- "to flee, to escape" + suffix (nom. act.) ak, is not well documented in the linguistic sources and does not find universal acceptance. The recent etymology of the Turkic ethnic name kaş (< kaş) + the Iranian ethnic name šak, i.e., saka, is a vague hypothesis which can hardly be confirmed by historical facts.

Bibliography: The relevant linguistic and historic data (with a critical survey of the various etymological approaches) are brought together by G. Doctor, Türkischer und mongolischer Elemente im Neupersischen, iii, Wiesbaden 1967, 468 ff. An analysis of these facts from a historic-ethnological aspect is given by L. Krader, Ethnonyms of Kazakh, in American Studies in Altasia Linguistics, Bloomington-The Hague 1962, 123 ff. A. von Gabain analyses the social status of kasak elements in the history of the Turkic peoples in her article Kasaketnöme, eine soziologisch-pkolnologische Studie, in Acta Orient., Hung. xi, 161 ff. The Russian linguistic and historic relations are described by G. Stökl, Die Entdeckung des Kasanmens, Munich 1953, and G. F. Bugayeva, Slavoturksznagmuocongym slow kasak i kazak (The mutual historic relations of the words kazak and kazah), in Etimoni, Moscow 1970, 143 ff.