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In modern times, the most important region bearing the name Khóšt is that comprised within the modern Afghan province of Pakhtún, lying to the south of the Sefid-Kúh range in the basin of the Khóšt, an affluent of the Kurram river which drains eastwards to the Indus; hence the ethnic and tribal connections of Khóšt with the regions of Kurram, Kohat and northern Waziristan on the modern Pakistani side of the Durand Line have always been close. Khóšt now forms an important forestry region of Afghanistan, and in the southern, sub-tropical zone, dates, citrus fruits, etc. are grown; recent Afghan governments have made considerable agricultural investment here (see J. Humuhm et alii, La geographie de l'Afghanistan, Etude d'un pays aride, Copenhagen 1959, 101, 105, and J. C. Griffiths, Afghanistan, London 1967, 119-29). In the 1920s, Khóšt was the epicentre of a conservative, traditionist Pathan rebellion against the tentative reforms of King Amán Allah, which seriously weakened the ruler's position and damaged the economic health of the country (March 1924-January 1925) (see W. K. Fraser-Tytler, Afghanistan, London 1967, 204-6; V. Gregorian, The emergence of modern Afghanistan, politics of reform and modernization, 1880-1956, Stanford 1969, 282-4; L. Dupree, Afghanistan, Princeton 1973, 449, 459, 479).

Finally, the Imperial Gazetteer of India, iii, 138, vi, 306, mentions a Khóšt in Balúčistán, the site of a small coalfield, 35 miles east of Quetta.

(C. E. Bosworth)

KHÓTAN, a town of the People's Republic of China, in the autonomous region of the Uygurs. The town, and the territory which depends on its resources as an oasis, lie between the desert of Tála-makan and the massif of Kun-luen on the one hand, and the Kura-Káš and Yürung-Káš rivers on the other. The kingdom of Khótan became known to the Chinese world in about 125 B.C., following the mission of Wang K'ien, under the name Yu-tien. The name represented by this transcription seems to have had no connection with the town of Yotkán. Although numerous archaeological relics have been found at that site, Yotkán cannot correspond to Yu-tien. In fact, according to Pelliot (Notes on Marco Polo, 412, s.v. "Cotan"), Yu-tien corresponds to *Odàn, with the variant *Odon arising from the transcription Yu-tien given by Huan-tsan (ibid., 409); the name encountered in the Khótanese text is just a transcription of the Chinese Yu-tien under the form Yúting, while documents of the 4th century in Kharoshthi script give the form Khótan (L. G. Cercenberg, Khotanosaksbiky yazlik, 10). Yotkán is a ruined pre-Islamic cemetery, approximately 8 km. west of the town itself.

In fact, the kingdom of Khótan was not really known to the Chinese until after the conquest of the Tarim basin, carried out by Han Wu-ti (140-87 B.C.), in the years following 120 B.C. and through the reconquest by the later Han between 73 B.C. and 60 A.D. Little is known of the history of the ruling dynasty and the name of the town is always transcribed Yu-tien in the Chinese sources. From the latter we learn that the population of the kingdom reached a total of 50,000. All that we can say is that this population spoke a language of Iranian type, which has become known as a result of discoveries made at the beginning of the 20th century and which has been deciphered principally by Lüders, Ston-Know and H. W. Bailey. It now seems that the Khótanese spoke a dialect of the Saka language.

It was in the course of the first centuries A.D. that the kingdom of Khótan received Buddhism. According to the Tibetan tradition, which agrees in some points with the account given by Huan-tsan, Buddhism was introduced to Khótan by a Kashmiri monk called Vairocana, during the reign, almost certainly legendary, of king Vijayasambhava (E. Zürcher, The Buddhist conquest of China, in Sinica Leidensia, xi, Leiden 1972, 340-1). This account is confirmed by the fact that one of the oldest dated Buddhist monuments is from 269 A.D. (A. Stein, Sand-buried ruins of Khótan, 1902, 495).

In the 7th century, Huan-tsang writes in his Memoirs (Wattors, On Yuan Chuan's Travels, ii, 296): "We arrive in the kingdom of K'iu-su-tan-ná. (Note: In Chinese, this signifies "Breast of the Earth"; it is the formal name used in the region. The local language uses the expression "Kingdom of Huan-ná". The Hiong-nou call it Yu-touen; the Hou (Iranians), Ho-tan; the Indians, K'iu-tan. Formerly they (the Chinese) called it Yu-tien; it is an incorrect form." (On this passage, cf. Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, 409-17).

Thus, in the T'ang period, the polite and literary form is "Gostana" or "Gaustana", difficult to interpret according to Pelliot; the local language used the expression Xúan-ná (Huana?), this name faithfully rendering the name which appears in the Khótanese texts under the form Hvatáná, Hvamna, and Hvam; the nomads of the north would have pronounced it *Odàn or *Odón, a name which is found much later in Syriac, translated from Persian, in the story "The History of the Patriarch Mar Yabullakak and the monk Rabban Sáund", published by Chabot (Paris 1895, 22), where the latter identifies the town of "Lótón" with Khótan. In fact, "Lótón" is an erroneous form from the Persian original, where the lám has appeared as a result of confusion with the initial ḍhī, whence we deduce the correct form "Ödon" proposed by Pelliot fifty years ago, while Budge (The monks of Kúbáli Khán, London 1928, 138 and Montgomeri (The history of Yabullaka III, New York 1927) have retained the form "Lótóin". This form appears in the works of Káshghari (Broekelman, 251), with "Odon" and "Khótan". Finally, the Iranians would have pronounced it Ho-tan (Xúut-tan) which assumes an original *Hyutan, precursor of the Khótan of the Muslims, while the Indians would have pronounced it K'iu-tan (*Khút-tan) which presupposes a form Khután or Khótan. The land was known to the Tibetans under the name of Li-yu, "land of Li", although they knew the town under the name of Hu-tan, which is just a transcription.

In the T'ang period, the kingdom of Khótan was bounded to the south by the Kun-luen, while in the east its territory touched that of Korání (Niya, Çérén and the Lob-Nor region), and in the west that of Káshghar (Khíesia) which stretched from the Pamirs and T'éen-shan to Maralbaš and beyond. The language used throughout the Khótan region was Saka-Khotanese, which was related to the Tadjik vernacular of the Pamirs, of which no ancient evidence has yet been recovered, to the language of Káshghar in the west and north, of which some traces have been recovered at Tumšuk (the Turkish name of a site whose ancient name has disappeared), and in the east to the language spoken in Korání, of which apparently no relics remain.

The kingdom of Khótan at that time had a large population which had, no doubt under the influence of Buddhism, lost all interest in expansion and showed an extreme aversion to matters of war; Huan-tsang noted that the Khótanese were remarkable
craftsmen with a considerable taste for literary pursuits, also for music and dance. The region was the centre of a considerable commercial activity, being placed on the southern branch of the Silk Route, which was in use throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages; through the Khotanese texts we possess accounts of the travels of officials to Kashgar and Kan-su, which permit us to gain an acquaintance with the geography of Central Asia, in particular the names of towns; thus we find that Kāshqār is Kyessa, Niya is Niha, Cercen is Ysnabārā patrām, Urmūn is Yrrtūm-cān, Turfan is Turpanā, rīthān is Raurāta, Yumen in Ywēyikē, etc.

The dynasty of the kings of Khotan in the T’ang period (7th-10th centuries), the family name, which was apparently Vīja (preferable from Viśa) was in existence before that time, for the history of the Siuei (83, 5b) mentions, according to Pelliot (op. laud., 419) a king called Vījāyanvīraka; under the T’ang, the dynasty is known to us from a list which can be reconstructed from the texts of the History of the T’ang and which can be partially cross-checked by reference to the names preserved in the Khotanese texts; a certain number contained in the latter cannot be placed with certainty in this list; these are: Vīṣanakhaṇa, Vīṣakīrti, Vīṣavākram and Vīṣasagrama. On the other hand, there are some that can be dated, in particular the last kings of the dynasty: Vīṣavamikhaṇa (912-966), Vīṣaśa (967-977) and Vīṣvākrama (978-992) (Gereben, op. cit., 12). It was shortly afterwards that the kingdom of Khotan was conquered by recently-converted Muslim Turks; the kingdom of Khotan was henceforward to be one of the collection of Turkish states in the region which constituted Turkestān.

The town of Khotan, unlike Kāshqār and the northern part of the Tarim basin, is not mentioned by the Ḫudūd al-‘alam in the description of the Turkish tribes (§ 13, p. 96) of the Yaghma of eastern Turkestān, but in that of China (§ 9, p. 84). As the Ḫudūd al-‘alam dates from the year 372/982-3, it may be supposed that in about the year 980, when king Vīṣvākrama, was alive, Khotan and its territory formed a sort of enclave between the region of Kāshqār which was occupied by the descendants of Satuq Bughrā Kān (died 344/955-6) and the territories belonging to China and Tibet; the king of Khotan, according to this source (p. 83), styled himself “Ruler of the Turks and the Tibetans” (‘asām al-Turk waʾ-ʾTubāt). A little later, Gardizī, who was writing after 431/1040, reports (according to Barthold, Oïlet o poïezidhe v Sërednyana Aïtya, 94) that even the town of Kai (7), situated at fifteen days’ march from Khotan in the direction of China, was under the domination of Toglūxūghuz Turks (cf. Huddād al-‘alam, 255). According to Gardizī, the inhabitants of Khotan were Buddhists, but he mentions a Muslim cemetery to the north of the town (ibid., 255, n. 3), and in the town itself two Christian churches, although no documentary evidence of this has been found. As regards the Muslim world, Gardizī shows us that in the first half of the 9th/10th century, Muslim proselytism was already actively exercised in Buddhist circles, and it is possible that the implanting of this group was a contributory cause of subsequent events.

At the beginning of the 5th/11th century, the Turkish rulers of Kāshqār had become very powerful (Barthold, 22 Veṣrēnas, Berlin 1936, 79 ff., particularly 88-90), and had founded the dynasty of the Karakhandis (see Ilek-kišāns). The son of Bughrā Kān Hāran, himself the grandson of Satuq Bughrā Kān, who called himself Kadr Kān Yūṣuf and reigned in Kāshqār from about 401/1010, decided, for reasons unknown to us, to conquer the territory of Khotan. Seeing that he died in 423/1033 (Ibn al-Aṣbīḥ s.a.), it is likely that the conquest of Khotan was accomplished sometime between the years 423 and 1032, for we possess money struck in his name at Kāshqār and at Yarkand from 404/1012-13 onwards (A. Markov, Inventarniy cataloq, etc., 192 ff.). On the conquests of Khotan, cf. Barthold, Turkestān, 281, n. 2.

Later, Khotan, like Kāshqār, passed under the authority of the Ilek-kišāns [q.v.], and subsequently under that of the Karā-kišāhs [q.v.]. After these events, the crisis arising in Central Asia as a result of the expansion of the Mongol empire led the Karārām-Shāh to make an agreement with Kūčit, who had deposed and expelled his father-in-law, the Gūr-Kān of the Karā-kišāh, and a partition of the western sector of the Karā-kišāh empire took place, between the two rulers, giving to the K Carrāzam-Shāh the territory to the east of the Sīr-Daryā as far as the heights of Kāshqār and of Khotan (Barthold, Turkestān, 356-7); after his succession to the throne, Kūčit, who had married the daughter of the Gūr-Kān, a Buddhist fanatic, undertook a fierce persecution of Islam in the regions under his authority, particularly in Khotan, after his agreement with the Carrāzam-Shāhs [q.v.]. According to Dīwānyā (tr. Boyle, 65-6, 70-3), Kūčit persecuted the Muslims cruelly and crucified the Imām ‘Alī al-Dīn Carrāzam Shāh at the door of his madrasa in Khotan. In the time of Haydar Mīrzā [q.v.], nothing more was known of this marty; even his tomb was unknown (Tāriḵ-i Dīwān, tr. E. D. Ross, 518, and ch. xiii). Thus there was no indigenous historical tradition at Khotan, or if there was, the texts have been lost. Arabic and Persian geographical literature provides us with only the most meagre of information; the real situation is misrepresented by al-Samʿāni (I. 189b) and by Yīqūt, who followed al-Samʿāni in his own writing (ii, 403).

Under the reign of Ǧōdegay, Dīwānyā (tr. Boyle, 527) reports that “the lands between the banks of the Amār-Daryā and the frontiers of Kītārī were placed under the orders of the Chief Minister Mahmūd Yalavāq and of his son Masʿūd Beg; those included Transoxiana, Turkestan, Oṭrār, the land of the Uyghurs, Khotan, Kāshqār, Dīnad, ‘Arrar, Fargāhān”. Rashīd al-Dīn (Diżm-i tawāriḵ, tr. J. A. Boyle, The successors of Genghis Khan, New York, London 1921, 54), also writes as follows: “The Kāʾan (Ǧōdegay) placed all the lands of the Kairāwān under (the orders of) Mahmūd Yalavāq, and (the region of) Becklāq and Karā Khodjīo, with the territory of Uyghuristan, Khotan, Kāshqār, Almalik, Qayqayāl, Samarkand and Bukhārā as far as the banks of the Oxus under (the orders of) Masʿūd Beg, the son of Yalavāq”. In the remainder of his work, he makes no further mention of Khotan; nevertheless, under the year 1253, Barthold (12 Veṣrēnas, 234) writes as follows: “After the re-establishment of order, the frontiers of his government (i.e. of Masʿūd Beg) were extended further: to him were subjected Transoxiana, Turkestan, Oṭrār, the land of the Uyghurs, Khotan, Kāshqār, Dīnad, ‘Arrar, Fargāhān”. After the death of Mengū (Mongke) in 1259, a conflict arose between Kūbīlāy [q.v.] and his younger brother Arik-būge in the course of which a cousin of Arik-būge, the Cāgātayid Alūgu, took to himself the entire area entrusted to the authority of Masʿūd Beg; the latter appealed to Arik-būge who gave him full authority to dispose of Alūgu, but in the course of his mission he
Khotan — Khotin

272, the population amounted to only 15,000; according to E. and P. Sykes, Through deserts and oases of Central Asia, London 1920, 216, the population was 50,000.

Bibliography: In addition to works cited in the article, see especially E. Bretschneider, Medieval researches, ii, 47 ff., 246 ff.; M. Hartmann, Chinesisch-Turkestans, Halle 1908, 93 ff.; on the state of the Khotjas and their connections with Khotan, cf. idem, Der islamische Orient, i, Berlin 1905, 195 ff. and the index. These sources may be completed by numerous works in Chinese.

(L. Hambis)

Khotin (in Ottoman Turkish usage Khoğin; in modern Turkish and in Romanian, Hotin; Polish Choczin and variants; German Hwlyhin [15th century], Chotin, Chotit, Chotcezn, etc.; Italian [18th century] Cucino; and other forms): a fortress and town on the right (formerly Moldavian) bank of the Dniester (Turda), 20 km. south of Kamenets Podolsk (Kaménic in [see Kamenicé]). Khotin is now (since the end of World War II) in the Ukrainian S.S.R., and forms the administrative centre of the raion of the same name in the oblast of Cernovits (Cernauti, Csernowitz).

Khotin, which occupied an easily-defensible site at the point where the important mediaeval trade route from the Baltic to Constantinople crossed the Dniester, was from the mid-14th to the late 18th century a military stronghold and commercial entrepôt of some importance. The region of Khotin, which was, in the 16th and 17th centuries, disputed between Poland and Moldavia, had attracted Ottoman attention as early as the reign of Mehmed II, and in the 16th century Muslim merchants frequented the route via Khotin to Poland. Khotin was besieged unsuccessfully by 'Othman II in 1630/1631; thereafter it was restored to Moldavian control, and is so described by Evliyâ Celebi, who visited it in the retinue of Melek Ahmed Pasha in 1658 (Seyhül-name, v, 124-5). In 1804/1805 Khotin was occupied by the Poles, but it was regained by the Ottomans in the following campaign season (Sihâhâr, Tarih, Istanbul 1928, i, 628 ff.). The Ottoman occupation of Podolia in 1836/1837 carried the frontiers of the Empire beyond the Dniester, but with the retrocession to Poland of Podolia, and the evacuation of Kamenica in 1810/1819, Khotin became the most important Ottoman fortress in the region of the upper Dniester; this importance was to increase in the course of the 18th century, as the conflict with Russia became ever more acute.

Khotin was occupied by the Russians in 1713; on its return to the Ottomans in 1725/1724, the old fortifications were rebuilt and increased in height by more than a half, as part of a general strengthening and rebuilding programme, which was supervised by a special commission sent from Istanbul. The contemporary Moldavian historian Cantemir described the Khotin of this period as the most elegant and well-defended fortified town in Moldavia, praise which is echoed in an Ottoman description of the town written at the same time. Also in 1725/1724, Khotin and its surrounding districts were removed from the jurisdiction of Moldavia and reorganised as an eyâlet, as part of the strengthened Ottoman frontier defences along the right bank of the Dniester, becoming, in the words of a German observer, "die einzige Vormauer der Moldau".

The 18th century stronghold of Khotin consisted of the medieval i⃤ kalî and the more extensive new outer works encircling the old fortress on three sides.
familiar (see al-Danîrî, op. cit., ii, 353-4), and modern systematic practice has simply ratified the vox populi in retaining the name ‘hussâs’ and applying it to the Somalian Cercopithecus pygmaeus. In conclusion, having been born out of confused images of the gibbon and a pygmy in travellers’ tales, to become subsequently a monstrous human mutation blighted by divine punishment, the musâs has finally been placed, by common logic, in one of the families defined by kird.


**KIRGIS,** a Turkish people, mentioned as early as the oldest Chinese accounts of Central Asia (from the 2nd century A.D.) under the name Kien-Kuen, which according to P. Pelliott (*JA*, Ser. 2, vol. xv, 137) goes back to a Mongol word, singular kirghun. The lands of the Kirgiz are not exactly defined in these sources; according to a very reliable source, the land of the Kien-Kuen lay north-west of the land of the K‘ang-Klu, i.e. of Sogdiana. The name Kirgiz first appears in the Orkhon inscriptions of the 8th century; at that time the Kirgiz (as the contemporary Chinese annals also tell us) lived on the Upper Yenisei (Turkish Kem), north of the Kög-men or Sayan mountains. The same name (Kûkmân) is also mentioned in Gardîzî (W. Barthold, *Oitc o poeski v Sredveynom Azii*, 86 = ed. Ābdî al-Hayy Ĥabîbî, Tehran 1347/1968, 262); according to this source, the capital of the Khân of the Kirgiz was 7 days’ journey north of these mountains. There is also said that the Kirgiz had red hair and a white colour of skin (surbî-i mây wa sapîl-i pâsh), which is explained by their alleged relationship with the Slavs; the same anthropological features, of which there is no longer any trace among the modern Kirgiz, are mentioned in the Chinese *Ta’ng-чу*; linguistically, the Kirgiz were then already Turkicised. They did not come to the fore politically till about 840 A.D., when they succeeded in conquering the lands of the Uyyghur in Mongolia. Nothing was known in Muslim lands of this event; Marqâzî’s endeavours (*Osterröpische und ostasiatische Straß-süge*, Leipzig 1903, 97-2) to connect with this the story in Dzhâiz of the defeats of the Toghuughzûn, can be utterly rejected; like Kudâna (ed. de Gоеjî, 262, l. 13) Dzhâiz only refers to the hostility between the Toghuughzûn and the Kharqûh (Kârku, *q.f.*). Ištâkhêrd (ed. de Gоеjî, 9-10) and others mention the Kirgiz (*Khirkiţ’un*) as eastern neighbours of the Kirmak (Kirmak) and as northern neighbours of the Kharqîh and Toghuughzûn; in the east their lands are said to have stretched to the ocean.

Most important article of export for trade with Muslim lands was musk. The ethnic and historical continuity between the Kirgiz and the people living today under the same name in the USSR is supposed but not proved. The Kirgiz were given out of Mongolia in connection with the foundation of the empire of the Khatûs in the beginning of the 10th century (see Kârê Kâtirî) and the advance of the Mongol peoples; on the other hand, a body of Kirgiz must have migrated as early as this century southwards to the present abode of the genuine Kirgiz (Kara Kîriz); according to the *Ihidîd al-‘ilm* (i. 184, tr. Minorsky, 98, comm. 293-4), even the town of Panči (the modern Aksu in Chinese Turkestan) was in possession of the Kirgiz. The Kirgiz are not mentioned again in this region till the 16th century; what the Chinese C‘ang-Tê, who was there in 1529, records of the Kirgiz (especially on the use of dog-sledges, cf. Breternich’s *Missional researches*, i, 129) he had only been told and did not see himself, and these stories probably do not refer to the people of the land he passed through. The main body of the people had probably remained on the Upper Yenisei; the Käar Khatûs, when driven out of North China had to fight with these Kirgiz during their trek westwards. In the fertile region of the modern administrative district of Minusinsk the Kirgiz gradually adopted agriculture and a settled mode of life. According to the *Ihidîd al-‘ilm* (i. 178, tr. Minorsky, 97, comm. 389) there was only one town among the Kirgiz, called Kêmikî, where their Khatûs lived; no other towns or villages, but only tents; on the other hand, Rashid al-Dîn says (ed. Bezzîn, *Trubenf. Post. Old. Arikh. Ovch.*, vii, 168-9) that the Kirgiz had "many towns and villages". From these and similar statements Radloff has drawn the conclusion (*JA*, Ser. 6, vol. ii, 328) that the present state of Kirgiz culture is much lower than it used to be.

In the 13th century the Kirgiz on the Yenisei had to submit to the Mongols under Cîngiz Khatûs (q.v.). Negotiations for submission were already commenced in 1207, but it was only settled in 1218 when the last rebellion was put down. After the decline of the empire of the descendants of Cîngiz Khatûs the Kirgiz had sometimes to be under the yoke of the Mongols, sometimes of the Kalmucks, and sometimes of the Russians; in 1607 they recognised the suzerainty of the Kazakh, but by 1609 we find them killing a tax-collector sent by the Kazakh. In 1642 they were described by the Kalmuck Khan Batur as Kalmuck, in 1646 by the Russian plenipotentiary Danyîl Arîbînskiy as Russian subjects. In 1703 they were transferred by the Kalmucks, by arrangement with Russia, southwards to the region of the modern Semîreçë; they are then said to have numbered 5,000-4,000 tents. As mentioned above, a portion of the Kirgiz had migrated at a much earlier date; shortly after 1514 a certain Mûhammad is mentioned as being invested as Khân of the Kirgiz by Sa‘îd Kham the ruler of the Mongols (*Trâkî-i Râşîd, tr. E. D. Ross*, London 1899, 141); in the 17th century the Kirgiz were for the most part under the rule of the Khânos of the Kaçåk. The Kirgiz were called *Bûnt* by the Kalmucks; they were nearly all driven out from Semîreçë to Farghânà and Karatègni; it was only after the destruction of the Kalmuck empire by the Chinese (1758-9) that they returned to their old settlements in the southern part of Semîreçë. At this date the name Kirgiz was transferred to the Kaçåk by the Russians; to distinguish them from the latter, the true Kirgiz were called...
Kirgiz (Kara Kirgiz). The term "Kara" was never adopted by the people themselves and thus never really supplanted in Semirecy, the Kara Kirgiz, outwardly at least, professed Islam; in their epic, which takes its name from the principal hero Manas, the wars against the infidels and the hordes described as wars of religion. Unlike the Kazak, the Kara Kirgiz had neither princes or nobles; the elders, called Manah, were not chosen by any kind of election but owed their position entirely to their personal influence. Owing to the continual state of war, the tribes of the Kara Kirgiz did not break up into small subdivisions as was the case with the tribes of the Kazak; an aul (camp) of the Kara Kirgiz comprised the members of a whole tribe and therefore occupied a much greater area than an aul of the Kazak. In the 18th century authority over the Kara Kirgiz was claimed by the Chinese, in the 19th by the Ozbegs in Farghana and later by the Russians; the final establishment of Russian rule dates from 1864. The prosperity of the Kara Kirgiz has been seriously affected by the Russian occupation and particularly by the rising of 1916, when a considerable portion of the people migrated to China; the Russian government resolved—but nothing came of it owing to the revolution of 1917 to take from the Karag Kirgiz all their grazing-grounds except the valley of the Tekes and to throw these lands open for Russian colonisation.

Until recently in both Russia and Western Europe the name "Kirgiz" meant particularly the Kazak; they are sometimes called also "Kiris-Kaisak" (Kaisak, corrupted from Kazak, to distinguish them from the Russian Cossacks). On the separation of the Kazak from the Ozbeg, cf. Abu 'l-Khiyar and Kazak. The whole of the Kazak people was for long under the rule of one Khan who therefore had a considerable military force at his disposal; Khan Kusin (d. 924/1518) was particularly powerful. In spite of several defeats from the Mongols allied with the Ozbegs in the 16th century, the Kazak still had a strong nomadic kingdom at the end of the century under the rule of Khan Tawakxul who, during the last years of the reign of Khan 'Abd Allâh b. Iskandar [924] was able to make a successful incursion into Mâvar al-Nahr, and later still even hold the town of Tashkent. In the 17th century the power of the Khans only rarely extended over the whole people; but about this time Tashkent and Farghana were usually in the possession of the Kazak, sometimes under nominal recognition of the suzerainty of the Khans of the Ozbegs. At this time must have taken place the division of the Kazak into three "Hordes" as called by the Kazak themselves by dâdas "hundred"; the great horde (shu dâdas) occupied the most easterly, the little (khiš dâdas) the most westerly part of the so-called "Kirgiz steppes" and between the two the central horde (qura dâdas). Towards the end of the 17th century this division was already an accomplished fact. Khan Tyaweja, celebrated as the law-giver of his people (in 1694 a Russian embassy was received by him in the town of Turkistan and in 1698 one from the Kalmucks), still ruled all three Hordes and had a representative in each of them. In 1717 unsuccessful negotiations for the submission of all three Hordes to Peter the Great were conducted; in 1723 the towns of Sairam, Tashkent and Turkistan were conquered by the Kalmucks. For a short period after this, the suzerainty of the Khan of the Little Horde was recognised by all the Kazak and the agreement embodying this was sealed by the sacrifice of a white horse; but the treaty had no practical results. In 1730, Abu 'l-Khiyar negotiated with Russia and concluded a treaty by which he declared himself and his people Russian subjects. This treaty was renewed several times in the 18th century; but it was not till the 19th century, especially after 1874, when the Russians were firmly established on the southern frontier of the Kirgiz steppes on the Sr Daryâ, that Russian rule became definitely established over the steppes and their inhabitants. The eastern part of the steppes was administered from Siberia and the western from Orenburg; regulations for the government of the Sibirian Kazak were published in 1822 and again in 1868. Even after the abolition of the Khan's authority, the descendants of Chingiz Khan or "Sultans" exercised a considerable influence over the people as a nobility (among the Kazak called "white bones", akit sîyek); their authority has been gradually destroyed by the measures of the Russian Government. The last popular leader of the Kazak was Kene sar, who fought against the authorities in Siberia and Orenburg from 1842 in the mountains of Alâ Taü; several risings were stirred up until 1873 by his son Sadik (so-called by the Russians, properly Siddik). Another son, Abnar, later wrote the life of his father Kene sar and of his brother Sadik, entitled: Sultan Kene sar-i Sadik. Biografisheiy otkki sultana Akhmet Kene sarina. Obobrano diya peçati i sukhobnî primeçaniami E.T. Smirnovoî, Tashkent 1889 (review by W. Rosen in Zap., iv, 122-3).

The most southern part of the Kirgiz steppes was conquered in the 19th century by the Ozbegs of Farghana and Khiwa and partly colonised; the advance of the Russians in this part was therefore assisted by the Kazak. After the foundation of the general-governorship of Turkestan (1867) and the general-governorship of the Steppes (1882) (Semirecy belonged at first to the latter, but was later again united to Turkestan), the government of Kirgiz steppes had less unity than before. On the other hand, after the Revolution an administrative unit was established called at first by the Russians the "Kirgiz Republic" and by the people themselves "Kazakstân". Today the Kirgiz form one of the Union Republics in the USSR. The number of the population in the Kirgiz Socialist Soviet Republic was 3,145,000 in 1973 (43.8% Kirgiz, 24.2% Russians, 11.3% Uzbek, etc.). The whole number of Kirgiz living in the USSR was 1,432,000 in 1970. The number of Kirgiz living in China and Afghanistan is over 100,000. The Kirgiz language belongs to the northwestern (Kipchak) group of Turkic languages.

**Bibliography:** There exists the following guide to the bibliographies: E. E. Noviçenko, Bibliografisya bibliografii o Kirgizii. 1832-1967. Antolirovanîy ukaštælit literaturi, Frunze 1969.— The most important of earlier bibliographies are: A. N. Karuzin Bibliografiskei ukaštæli statey, kasnoviklyhva etnografii Kirgizov i Karazigrov, in Etnografiskei Obozrevnyy ix (1891); N. Veselovskiy, Dopolnyte k bibliografiskei ukaštæli statey, kasnoviklyhva Kirgizov i Karazigrov, sostavlenomu A. N. Karuzinu, in Etnografiskei Obozrevnyy, ix (1891); A. E. Alekterov, Ukaštæli knig, jurnal bîk i gazetnyh statey i samhlo o kirgizakh, in Izvestyi Obshhestva Arheologii, Istoriî i Etnografii pri Imperatorskom Kazanskom Universitate, xvi-xx (1900-4); Z. L. Amin-Shapiro, Literatura o Kirgizii (1928-1945). Antolirovanîy ukaštælit, Frunze 1963; idem, Literatura o Kirgizii (1952-1976). Antolirovanîy ukaštælit, Frunze 1965; idem, Antolirovanîy
They were to a certain extent tributary to the Tatars. Occasional plunderings of these towns by the Golden Horde (see 1299-9, or sieges, e.g. 1334), remained incidental.

Kîrm is only rarely mentioned by the Arab geographers (and even then partly following the Italian reports, as by Ibn al-Irīsī). The first contact with Islam dates from a campaign of the Kûm Sâljûkîd sultan Kay Khusâd ala-Dîn II [q.v.] (616-34/1219-30). After the Golden Horde occupied the peninsula, first in 1223 and then, definitively, in 1236-9, the religious situation did not change immediately. At the instigation of the Egyptian Mamlûks (who entertained trade relations with the peninsula) a mosque was erected at Old Kîrm (also Solikhâl/Solzhud); another was built by the Khân Özâgh (712-12/1312-24) [q.v.].

During the latter’s reign, Sunni Islam had gained a firm footing among the Tatars of Kîrm, like among the rest of the Golden Horde. From Egypt shorelives influences of the futuwwa [q.v.] asserted themselves.

Next, there existed of old also Jewish settlements, but little is known about them in these centuries except from tombstones. Karaites or Karâ‘im [q.v.] were found at Çufut Kale, and the Orthodox Christians had a bishopric of Gothia at Old Kîrm. Western or Latin Christianity, supported mainly by the Franciscans, was represented by the Genoese until the downfall of the latter in 1475. Already in 1261 a Latin bishop is mentioned, and in 1326 the bishopric of Kafsa was founded. Its jurisdiction stretched from Varna (in modern Bulgaria) to Sarây [q.v.], the capital of the Golden Horde. The bishopric of Cherson, which came into being in 1303, was definitively established in 1333, with parishes in the individual towns. From here efforts were made to effect a union with the other Christians and to start missionary work among the Tatars, but at the end of the 14th century these attempts came to an end for lack of success. From 1351 until after 1370 there had even existed a Latin bishopric at Sarây.

In the 14th century, during embittered fights with the Venetians in the Mediterranean and the Aegean Sea, the Genoese founded trading factories in Sughdâk (Russian Suvoâ), in Balkalâva (then Cemâlo), in modern Sévastopol, in Tana (Azov, Turkish Azak [q.v.]) and in Moncastro (Ağ Kîrmân [q.v.], Kumanian Cetaten Albû, since 1368) to the west of the mouth of the Dniepr. Until 1343 the Venetians had a colony at Tana (Azov). Besides Italians, who had their own rule and system of justice, there were living in these towns Arabs from various Near Eastern lands; Turks from Anatolia; Turks [q.v.]; Greeks; and above all, such a large number of Armenians which Kîrm sometimes called Armenia Magna or Armenia Maritima. About the Crimean Goths we are informed by reports of the 15th century, and latterly in the 16th century by Angier Ghislain de Busbecq, ambassador of the Austrian emperor to Sîleymân II (see E. S. Forster, The Turkish letters of Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, Oxford 1927, repr. 1968; W. von den Steinen, Vier Briefe Busbecqs aus der Türkei, 1920). Since that time they have merged with the Kîrm Tatars.

The Mongols of the Golden Horde had a governor on the peninsula (hîkim or wîli), who kept up his own diplomatic relations with the Nile valley. We hear also of an "amir of the right wing" and of the "left wing of the army". Until the middle of the 15th century Kîrm, thinly populated except for the coasts, remained a centre, especially through Byzantine intermediaries on the Dardanelles, for trade with Egypt. For a long period via the Kîrm slaves
al-Kulayni, Abu Djafar Muhammad — Kulja

Peschpâyûn whose Persian name Kolôn, with imâla, was Arabised as Kulayn and Kulun. His nîsha is thus variously given in the sources as al-Kulaynî, al-Kulunî, or, erroneously, al-Kalifû.

Few facts concerning his life are known. Since his chief transmitter of Imâmî traditions were several scholars of Kumn, it is certain that he studied in that town for a prolonged time, most likely during the last decade of the 3rd century A.H. (903-13).

He also transmitted from several scholars of Rayy, among them his maternal uncle Muhammad b. A'îl al-Kulaynî al-Râzî, known as A'îlan, and al-Nâdirî describes him as the shaykh of the Imâmîyya in Rayy in his time. It is uncertain if it was in Naysâbûr or elsewhere that he heard Muhammad b. Ismâ'îl al-Naysâbûrî, his transmitter of the traditions and views of the prominent Imâmî scholar al-Fâdî b. Shâdhân of Naysâbûr, whom he evidently held in high esteem. At an unknown date, perhaps in the first quarter of the 4th century A.H. (913-23), he moved to Baghdad where he lived and taught in the Darb al-Sîkîla near the Bâb al-Kûfâ on the west bank of the Tigris. Here he completed his voluminous Kitâb al-Kâfî, on which he is said to have worked for twenty years. The book, though mostly a collection of traditions of the Imâmî, was meant to be a guide to authoritative Imâmî doctrine in theology and fiqh. Thus it is arranged according to subject matter and tends to contain only those traditions which the author considered as reflecting orthodox teaching. Only exceptionally are the views and elaborations of Imâmî scholars quoted, such as the eleventh century of al-Fâdî b. Shâdhân on the law of inheritance. The work is divided into the usûl, dealing mainly with theology, prophecy, the imâmât and prayers; the furû'î, dealing with fiqh; and a final volume, entitled K. al-Ra'awd, containing miscellaneous traditions of mostly edifying or paraenetic character. His other works, all of which are lost, included a refutation of the Kârâmîta, a book on transmitters (ridgâfî), a collection of letters of the Imâmîs, an anthology of poems about them, and a book on the interpretation of dreams. The date of his death is given as 328/940-41 or 329/940-1. The latter date, mentioned by al-Nâdirî, is more likely to be correct, since al-Tâs, who in his earlier K. al-Fîhrîs gives the year 328, in his later K. al-Ridgîl specifies Shâbân 329/May 941. The funeral prayer was led by the Imâmî Hasanî Bû Kîrât Muhammad b. Dâ'îrâî, and he was buried near the Bâb al-Kûfâ.

The reputation of al-Kulaynî and his K. al-Kâfî appears to have been modest during his lifetime and for a century after his death. Ibn al-Nadîm (writing in 377/987-9) does not even mention him, and Ahmad b. Ahsûn (d. 423/1031) observed that his tomb had become obliterated. The K. al-Kâfî was evidently not widely used in the Imâmî communities as an authoritative source of fiqh. Though the Shaykh al-Mu‘înî (d. 413/1022) in Baghdad referred to it as "one of the most important and useful books of the Shi‘a", his student the Sharîr al-Murtada (d. 436/ 1044) included al-Kulaynî in his general censure of the Imâmî traditionist school of Kumn and accused him of including numerous forged and racially absurd traditions in the K. al-Kâfî. It seems to have been largely due to the influence of the Shaykh al-Tâsî (d. 460/1068), who praised al-Kulaynî and relied extensively on the K. al-Kâfî in his fiqh works, that the latter gained popularity. The favour in which the K. al-Kâfî was held by the pro-Mu‘âzziyya Imâmî school of Baghdad, in spite of the criticism of al-Murtada, was partially based on al-Kulaynî’s support of the theology of the anti-anthropomorphist wing within the school of Kumn which was later represented by Ibn Bâhawâysh al-Shâfîkî, the only scholar of Kumn whose works were preserved in large number, evidently because of the author’s relative closeness to Mu‘âzziyya theological doctrines. The K. al-Kâfî soon came to be considered as one of the four canonical collections of traditions on which Imâmî fiqh is to be based, and often as the most authoritative one among them. It reached the peak of its fame in the Šāfâwîd and post-Šâfâwîd age, when numerous commentaries, interpretations, glosses, studies of various aspects, Persian translations, and an abridgment of it were composed. A tomb of al-Kulaynî with a khôba was now shown on the east bank of the Tigris near the modern al-Ma‘âmîn bridge in Baghdad, and has continued to attract large numbers of visitors until the present day.


(W. Madelung)

KULDJîA or CHULDJA, modern Ili or I-ning, a town in the fertile and mineral-rich upper valley of the Ili river [q.v.] in Central Asia. For the mediæval history of the district in which modern Kuldjîa lay, see AMLÂKH.

The town of Kuldjîa ("Old Kuljîa") was probably a new foundation in 1762 by the Chinese after their victory over the Kalmucks [see KALMUK] in 1759, and they named it Nîng-yüan-chen. Two years later the town of Hoi-yüan-chen was founded as the headquarters of the Chinese governor-general (dsamtsân) of Chinese Turkestan; this was known as "Great" or "New" Kuljîa. The Imperial government resettled in the largely depopulated area, amongst other peoples, 6,000 families of Muslim Turks from Kasgâr, after the devastation of the latter province during the wars with the Kalmucks; these came to be called the 'Tarângû' or 'agriculturists'. Also in the 18th century were settled there Chinese Muslims (probably, in fact, of mixed Chinese and Uyghur Turkish blood) called the Dungan or Tung-kan. In 1831 a trade treaty was made at Kuljîa between the advancing Russians and the Chinese, opening the upper Ili region to Russian traders, and in 1860 the Treaty of Peking between Russia and China gave both Russia and Britain the right to establish consulates in, amongst other places, Kuljîa. In 1862 W. Radlov visited both Old and New Kuljîa and described them fully in his Aus Siberien, Leipzig 1863, ii, 305 ff., 316 ff., see also his Das Ilî-Thalî in Hoch Asien und seine Bewohner, in Petermann’s Mitteilungen (1866); a decade or so later, the American traveller E. Schuyler visited Old Kuljîa and its hinterland, see his Turki- stan, notes of a journey in Russian Turkestan, Kha- kun, Buxhara, and Kuljîa, London 1876, ii, 156-201.

Following a Dungan rebellion in Shen-su, which spread to Kan-su [see KANSU] and other Muslim
areas of western China proper in 1862, revolt also broke out among the Muslim population of northern Chinese Turkestan, sc. in the province of Dzungaria, amongst both Tarančis and Dungans, and in 1863 it spread to the Kul'dja area. After hard fighting between the Chinese authorities and the rebels, New Kul'dja was captured in 1865 by the rebels and completely razed; Schuyler, op. cit., ii, 162-4, found the site utterly deserted apart from the one or two houses of Dungan squatters. The Russian consulate in Kul'dja and a Russian factory in the area were destroyed in this strife. The Dungans and Tarančis now began to fight amongst themselves, and after much inter-ethnic warfare, power passed in 1867 to a Taranči leader who styled himself Sulţān A'li Khan or Abu 'l-A'li (in Russian sources, often Abil-Oglja); after savage massacres perpetrated by the Tarančis, some 5,000 Dungans and others fled westwards into Russian territory for refuge. In 1867 also, Ya'qūb Beg [q.v.], a Khokandī by birth who had earlier fought against the Russians at the battle of Ak Masjidî (see KHOJAND), established his power in Kāshqarīa, sc. the southern part of Chinese Turkestan. Since Ya'qūb Beg was believed to be anti-Russian and received two diplomatic missions from British India, the appearance of an ostensibly hostile power in Central Asia disturbed Russia, and was a factor in the Russian decision to annex completely in 1875-6 the Khânate of Khokand [q.v.]. It further led to the Russian occupation in 1871 of Kul'dja and the upper Ili basin, this being announced as a temporary measure, till China should re-establish her authority in Kāshqarīa and Dzungaria. The local ruler A'li Khan was deported to Russia, and lived out his life there as a state pensioner.

The Russians probably assumed that Ya'qūb Beg would never be dislodged from power and that the Kul'dja district would eventually be permanently annexed. In fact, Ya'qūb Beg was defeated in 1876-7 by the Chinese forces and died in May 1877; his state collapsed totally and Chinese authority was restored in Eastern Turkestan. In 1879 negotiations began between the Chinese diplomat Ch'ung-hu and the imperial Russian government, but the Treaty of Peking made in that year was abortive, and negotiations dragged on for a considerable time, the retrocession of Kul'dja being used as a bargaining counter for extracting concessions elsewhere, till in 1881 the Treaty of St. Petersburg was made, and in 1883 Kul'dja was finally evacuated by Russia. Russia nevertheless retained trading privileges in the upper Ili valley, received an indemnity of 9 million dollars for the expenses of the Russian occupation, and acquired consulates at Kul'dja and Kāshqar which in the ensuing decades gave her important influence in Chinese Turkestan, e.g. during the period of the Chinese Revolution 1927-28, when Chinese settlers in the Kul'dja region were massacred by the Muslims and the Russian consular defence forces of troops enlarged. Chinese Turkestan was from 1882 onwards organised as a formal province of China under the name of Sin-kiang "New dominion". The population of [Old] Kul'dja was estimated at 2,700 in 1892, of whom 4,100 were Muslims; two or three years later, Schuyler estimated the population of the town at 10,000, over half of whom were Tarančis. These estimates were made at a time when the whole region was in a devastated and depopulated condition, and by ca. 1900, the estimated population of Kul'dja had risen to 30,000.

When the authority of the Manchu Imperial government in the Sin-kiang capital of Urgench crumbled in 1911, a revolutionary government proclaimed its independence in the Ili region, but in 1912 the new Chinese governor of the whole province, Yang Tseng-hsin (1911-28) managed to conciliate the separatists and secure unification of the Ili and Sin-kiang regions (see R. Yang, Sinkiang under the administration of governor Yang Tseng-hsin, 1911-1928, in Central Asiatic Jnl., vi 1961, 270-7). Yang weathered a further political crisis in 1916-17, when thousands of Kazakhs fled from Tsarist Russian oppression into the Ili and Kāshqar regions (see 1916, 395-8), and under his long tenure of power, the whole of Chinese Turkestan enjoyed an unwonted period of prosperity and firm government. He kept up good relations with Soviet Russia, and even after the Kuomintang's diplomatic break with Russia in 1927, the Russian consulates at Kul'dja and in other towns remained open. His successor Chen Shu-jen followed a similar policy, and in a secret treaty of 1931 conceded to the Russians rights to commercial offices in Kul'dja or Ili, Urumchi, etc.

These governors in the far west of China had been virtually autonomous, but in 1942 Chiang Kai-shek managed to extend the direct control of Ch'ung-k'ing over Sin-kiang, with disquieting effects on the non-Chinese population elements there. Hence in November 1944 there was a rebellion of the Kazakh Turks in the Ili region, soon joined by the Uyghurs. An Eastern Turkestan Republic was proclaimed in Kul'dja, independent of the Sin-kiang Chinese provincial government in Urumchi. The Kuomintang government in distant Ch'ung-k'ing was unable to do more than come to a compromise with Ahmad Djin's régime in Kul'dja, but by the end of 1948 its influence and representative position was in any case declining perceptibly. In September 1949 representatives of both the Kul'dja régime and the Urumchi one started negotiating with the Communists in Peking, and in December of that year a Communist Provincial People's government was established in Sin-kiang. The Communists eventually accorded to the province a certain autonomy, and in 1954 the Kul'dja region was made into the Ili Kazakh Autonomous District of what in 1955 became the Sin-kiang Uighur Autonomous Region. Now, under the Chinese name of I-ning, Kul'dja is one of the chief towns of that Region.

(II, 255, III, 2). On the other side, we have seen that the problem for the metaphysician is to know who established the existence of its object. Ibn Sinā believes that this object, being implied in all sciences, does not need to be vouched for by one of them. Moreover, it is for metaphysics to provide the role of supplying the other sciences with the basis of their object. Ibn Rushd criticises this viewpoint, but by relying on his own one, namely that the first philosophy poses the question to itself about substance as the first analogue of being. "Ibn Sinā, believing in the truth of the doctrine which does not want any of the sciences to set forth its own principles, and taking that simpliciter, believes that it is the task of the person who concerns himself with the first philosophy to give a clear exposition of the existence of substance apprehensible by the senses, eternal or not. He say that the natural scientist posits by hypothesis that nature exists (yūdī'u waḍā'ū anna 't-fabis maadhīda) and that the scholar of divine science is the one who gives the demonstrable proof of its existence" (Tafsīr, iii, 1423-4). Ibn Rushd then replies: "Yes, the specialist in the first philosophy seeks for the principles of substance as substance and sets forth clearly that the separateness of substances is the principle of the physical substance. But in making clear this search, he constantly calls for (yūdā'du) what physics clearly sets forth, whether in regard to the substance which can be generated and is corruptible, in the first book of the Physics (189 B 30-192 b 34), where it is demonstrated that it is made up of matter and form, or whether in regard to the eternal substance, in Book viii (260 a 20 ff.), where it is set forth that the driving force of that substance is stripped of all matter. Then he clearly lays down that the principles of the substance which are neither the Universal ideas (al-kulliyāt) nor the Numbers (al-adād) [of Plato]" (ibid., 1424-5). One should mention a final divergence between the two philosophers. Ibn Rushd notes that Aristotle, in the tenth book of the Metaphysics, has an enquiry into the unit, the multiple, the identical (biwāna ḫanū), the similar, the opposite and into still further notions "which bring out the general concomitants (al-lawāhis al-tāmmah) of the being as such" (Tafsīr, iii, 1403). In effect, metaphysics is a speculation about the being as such and about the "things" which are concomitant with it (al-umār al-lāḥika lahu) (ibid., iii, 1395). Now we have seen that what is concomitant with being for Ibn Rushd is the division of being for Ibn Sinā. It seems that this fundamental divergence holds good for all the other oppositions.

Ibn Sinā's metaphysics is consequently open to a region beyond the world, the earth and the heavens; it makes a mystical system possible. For Ibn Rushd, on the contrary, although metaphysics studies the principles of being which are objects of other sciences, it is not the foundation of those sciences, but their completion. He writes in his Tafsīr, ii, 701, "Since ... each science only concerns itself with studying a certain being which is its special object, it is clear that there must necessarily exist a science which studies the absolute being (al-khwīyān al-nuflahā); if there were not, our knowledge of things would be completely exhaustive (lam tustuwa ma-rifat al-askāhīyā)" (Tafsīr, ii, 701). Furthermore, whilst Ibn Rushd seeks for the first cause of the movements of substances apprehensible by the senses, corruptible or incorruptible, and finds it in the immobile Prime Mover, Ibn Sinā sets himself the task of "making an enquiry into the first cause from which every being is brought about by causality (kullu maadhī maḥādhī) in as much as it has been the result of causality, and not simply in as much as it is a mobile being (maadhī nuflahā) or a non-mobile being (maadhī mutanākhīna)" (Sherī, Ikhāyāt, i, 14). But there is a problem there; it is not possible for metaphysics to speculate on causes in as much as they are causes simpliciter (al-asāb bi-nā hīya ashāb mulāhā), in the first place because this science treats of notions "which do not raise the question of proper accidents owed to these causes as such, such as the notions of universal and particular, of act and capability, of possibility and necessity" (ibid., 7); and then because the science of causes taken simpliciter presupposes that a cause of causes has been established for the things which have a cause (shābīl al-asāb li t-umār dāvāl al-asāb). Ibn Sinā adopts here a very clear view of the problem of causality; it is not sufficient for the existence of a cause to be demonstrated in the eyes of reason. The existence of causes and effects is not proved by an intuition of causality; it comes from the division of being into the necessary and the possible. The first cause is thus the being necessary by itself. This is why there exists a being necessary so that all other beings have causes, since these exist even at the time when they are only possibilities. Now if one adopts as the point of departure experience of things apprehensible by the senses, all the causes that one will find are at the same time effects. One would not therefore be able, by tracing back the series of cause-effects, to reach the first cause, whether one went back infinitely or whether one came to a stop, as did Aristotle in his search for the Prime Mover, by an arbitrary decision: ḥūṣayn al-wallāh. On this point, Ibn Sinā has set forth a highly original idea in his Iǧārāt (ed. Sulaymān Duniyy, Cairo 1938, iii, 454-5). It concerns the position of the cause which is not the effect, in relation to the series of cause-effects. If it forms part of their ensemble (djjumla), it is necessarily an extreme limit (tārīf). But if one takes a series made into a hierarchical chain (lisāla mutarrābiya) of causes and effects which is made up only of cause-effects, "there is a need for an external cause for this ensemble, but undoubtedly in continuity with it in regard to limit (shābījūt ilā ilā ilāhīdagh ḥanā, lahilnāf tabaqatub bihā ... tārīf)". Ibn Sinā envisages the case where there is infinite, and then the cause-effects would form an infinitely limited ensemble. This ensemble is the universe; God is its "limit", but He is exterior to it. On the contrary, Ibn Rushd's Prime Mover is probably at the peak of the hierarchy of substance, but it is a substance and forms part of the world of substances. Just as metaphysics finishes off the sciences, likewise God supports the universe like the keystone of an arch.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

R. Arnauld:

MA CHUNG-YING (Matthews' Chinese-English Dictionary, Revised American Edition 1969, characters nos. 4310, 1505, 7489), also known as Lā su-ling, or "Little Commander" (Gā is an affectionate diminutive used in colloquial Kansu Chinese—see the Hsin-Hua tsu-tien, Peking 1971, 124; Su-ling: see Matthews', nos. 5585, 4043), the youngest and best-known of the five Chinese Muslim warlords comprising the "Vu Mu" clique (q.r.) which controlled much of Northwest China during the latter half of the Republican Period (1917-49). Little is known of Ma Chung-ying's early years.
He was born at Linsia (formerly Houchow) in southwestern Kansu, ca. 1910 (there is a contradiction in the Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, which holds that Ma was born in 1912). He had become a junior officer in 1926 "at the age of seventeen"; op. cit., 403, col. 1). Little is known of Ma's immediate family, but it is clear that he shared the same paternal grandfather as the Kansu-Chinghai warlords Ma Pu-ch'ing (Matthews', nos. 4310, 5363, 1168) and Ma Pu-fang (Matthews', nos. 4310, 5363, 1815), and that he was thus a scion of the powerful Ma family of P'ei-t'ang, a small village some 30 km. west of Linsia (Mei, op. cit. in Bibl., 660). Ma Chung-ying was also distantly related to the Kansu-Ningsia warlords Ma Hsing-k'uei (Matthews', nos. 4310, 2386, 3542) and Hsing-pin (Matthews', nos. 4310, 2386, 5259), the most powerful representatives of the Ma family of Han-chia-chi, a large village some 25 km. southwest of Linsia. Together these five Hui warlords were to become famous—or infamous—as the "Wu Ma" Northwestern Muslim clique.

Ma Chung-ying first entered military service during 1924 when, at about the age of fourteen, he joined the local Muslim militia. One year later, in August 1925, troops of the "Christian General", Feng Yü-hsiang, invaded Kansu. The invading forces, under the command of Feng's subordinate Liu Yü-fen, formed a part of the Northwest Army; more commonly known as the Kuomintang's First Kansu Army ("National People's Army"), a vast rabble which is estimated to have numbered in excess of 100,000 men during the late summer of 1925. Feng intended, through his subordinate Liu, to colonise large tracts of Kansu with Kuomintang soldiers; he also intended to finance his struggle against the Northeastern warlord Chang Tso-lin with taxes raised and opium cultivated in the Northwest. Not unnaturally, these aims found little favour with the people of Kansu, Ningsia and Chinghai; nor were the local warlords much inclined to support Feng Yü-hsiang.

In 1926, one year after the Kuomintang invasion of Kansu, Ma Chung-ying received his first commission as an officer in the forces commanded by one of his uncles, Ma Ku-chung (Boorman and Howard, op. cit. in Bibl., 463). During the same year, Liu Yü-fen, who was in occupation of the provincial capital at Lanchow, was attacked by a combination of local warlords from eastern Kansu (Sheridan, op. cit. in Bibl., 195-6). Fighting was prolonged and severe, but the Muslim warlords of western Kansu seemed to have remained aloof from the struggle, and Liu eventually succeeded in reimposing Kuomintang rule on the province. During his conflict, Ma Chung-ying, still only sixteen or seventeen years of age, is said to have "laid siege to and captured Linsia on his own initiative" (Boorman and Howard, ibid.). Liu Yü-fen ordered troops under the command of Ma Lin (a great-uncle of Ma Chung-ying) to recapture Linsia, but the young soldier easily defeated them, winning for himself a reputation as a military strategist and the nickname "Little Commander". Ma Chung-ying's triumph was short-lived, however, for his uncle and commanding officer Ma Ku-chung had not ordered the occupation of Linsia, and he dismissed his nephew for insubordination. The "Little Commander" learned this lesson well; he withdrew to the Sining area of Chinghai and began to build up his own forces.

Kuomintang "pacification" of Kansu left large areas of the province devastated, but failed to break the rebellious spirit of its people. In 1927 north-western Kansu was racked by a violent earthquake; this, combined with the increased use of good arable land for the cultivation of the opium poppy and arbitrary tax increases imposed by Liu Yü-fen, caused widespread famine. Early in the spring of 1928 the patience of the Northwestern Muslims ran out, and the standard of revolt was raised against the Kuomintang by the Muslim leader Ma T'ing-hsiang (Matthews', nos. 4310, 6404, 3076; see Sheridan, 250). Ma Chung-ying (who according to one source had fled to Sining, together with a group of his followers, because of an illicit affair with a young Muslim girl from a strictly orthodox family; see Ekvall, op. cit. in Bibl., 946) rapidly became involved in this revolt against the Kuomintang. The Muhammedans, who remained in Kuomintang hands, was besieged three times by Muslim forces. Robert Ekvall, an American who travelled south-eastern Kansu at this time, records that "The revolt had by this time assumed all the aspects of a holy war. Chanting prayers, forty or fifty thousand fighters went into battle with fanatical zeal... the young rebel leader Ma Chung-ying (sic) seemed to bear a charmed life and by his reckless courage gained the utmost in obedience and devotion from his ruffian troops. The Chinese (i.e. the Kuomintang) were panic-stricken at the slightest approach of the Moslems, but eventually, by machine-gun fire, machine-guns, 'derrys' and 'gatling'... proved superior" (Ekvall, 946-7). The Kuomintang was unable, however, to crush the Muslim revolt entirely; no sooner had the rebellion been suppressed in one area, than it broke out afresh in another. By September 1928 over 100,000 people had died (Sheridan, loc. cit.). Anti-Kuomintang feeling amongst the Muslims gradually gave way to racial hostility against all Han Chinese. On 14 February 1939, about 20,000 Muslims forced their way into Tangar, a city of some 5,000 households in western Kansu. An American eyewitness described the scene as follows: "[The Muslims] forced an entrance by ladder over the north wall. Immediately by they began to murder the Chinese in the most brutal way, cutting off the head with swords... The Muslims were in the city only about two hours, but during that time the official figures show more than 2,000 killed, 700 wounded, and $ 2,000,000 damage" (Sheridan, 251). Kuomintang reprisals against the Muslims were equally bloody. According to American diplomatic reports (see Sheridan, ibid.), the ravages of war and famine reduced people to cannibalism; between 1926 and 1929 as many as 2,000,000 people may have died. One casualty was Ma Chung-ying's father, who was executed on the orders of Liu Yü-fen in the winter of 1929 (Boorman and Howard, ibid.).

In 1929 Ma Chung-ying, his position strengthened by several victories over the forces of the Kuomintang, approached the Nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek with a request that his private army should be recognised as a Kuomintang frontier unit. At about this time, Feng Yü-hsiang declared himself independent of the National Government at Nanking; as a result of this, Ma Chung-ying's distant relative Ma Hsing-k'uei, the strongest of the "Wu Ma" clique, declared in favour of the nationalist cause. Ma Chung-ying went to Nanking, where he enrolled briefly at the military academy. In 1930 he returned to Kansu where he was appointed garrison commander at Kanchow (Changyeh) in the far northwest, near the frontier of Sinkiang [g.v.]; from here he controlled a small fief, including the towns of Suchow and An-hsi, which "freed him from any financial..."
worry and allowed him to prepare his army for an expedition to Sinkiang” (Nynman, op. cit. in Bibl., 102). Before striking out into Sinkiang, however, Ma seems to have made another bid to extend his personal power base in Kansu. Once again he met with failure, this time at the hands of his uncle Ma Pu-fang (Norrin, op. cit. in Bibl., 41).

In 1930 Sinkiang, China’s largest province, was under the control of Chin Shin-jen, an avaricious and incompetent warlord from Kansu; over 90% of Chin’s subjects were Muslims, but the Han Chinese warlord seems to have nurtured a fierce hatred for all Muslims, whether of Hui or Turkic ethnic origin. Chin’s anti-Muslim sentiment may well have derived from the various Hui risings in Kansu; certainly, when a combination of famine and war drove starving Han Chinese refugees to flee from his native Kansu to Sinkiang in the late 1920s, Chin welcomed them with open arms. Less than 200 km from the northwestern frontier of Ma Chung-ying’s fief in Kansu lay the ancient oasis city of Komul (Komul [g.v. in Suppl.]); when Chin Shu-jen seized power in Sinkiang during 1928, Komul (Chinese name Hami) was still a semi-independent state, ruled by the aged monarch Maqsud Shih, the last autonomous Khii-nate in Central Asia. When Maqsud died of old age in 1930, Chin Shu-jen, who held the heir-apparent hostage in Urumchi, the provincial capital, announced the abolition of the Khii-nate and its full absorption within China. Chinese officials took over the administration of Komul, and Chin began to settle Han Chinese refugees from his native Kansu on arable land evicted from the indigenous Uighur (g.n.) farmers. Local unrest grew rapidly, and in 1931, following the abduction of a local Muslim girl by a Han Chinese tax collector, open rebellion broke out.

One of the leaders of the Komul revolt, a Uighur called Yulbars Khan [g.v.] travelled to Suchow in north-eastern Kansu where he met Ma Chung-ying (now officially Commander of the 36th Division of the Kuomintang, though Yulbars comments that there were so many Mas in this force that it was commonly called the Mo-chia-chin, or “Ma House- hold Army”; see Yulbars, op. cit. in Bibl., 87-8). Ma agreed to enter the fray, ostensibly to help his Uighur co-religionists and in 1931 he led his troops into Sinkiang in an open challenge to Chin Shu-jen. Ma was wounded during the autumn, and withdrew temporarily to Kansu to recuperate. In August 1932 Ma’s troops again entered Sinkiang. Initially, they cooperated with the Uighurs in their struggle against Chin Shu-jen. Ma’s crack cavalry units, generally considered to have been amongst the best troops in China, fought their way to the outskirts of Urumchi before being repulsed by White Russian mercenaries under the command of Chin Shu-jen (see Wu, op. cit. in Bibl., 73-100); meanwhile, Uighur forces under Yulbars Khan and Khoja Niyaz Haddij took control of the greater part of southern Sinkiang, and an “East Turkestan Republic” was proclaimed at Koshgar [g.x.].

In April 1933 the incompetent Chin Shu-jen was ousted by Sheng Shih-ts’ai, his Chief-of-Staff. The new warlord, whose home province was Liaoning in the far Northeast, enjoyed the support of a group of some 3,000 battle-hardened Manchurian troops who had been driven into Siberia by the invading Japanese and repatriated to Sinkiang by the Soviet authorities. During the remainder of 1933, Ma Chung-  

ying’s forces made two further attempts to take Urumchi, and despite judicious use of his White Russian and Manchurian troops, Sheng was forced to appeal to the Soviet Union for aid. In January 1934, Soviet military units entered Sinkiang and attacked Ma Chung-ying’s cavalry with aeroplanes and, apparently, poison gas. The Muslim warlord was forced to fall back on Turfan, but instead of withdrawing to his old base in north-eastern Kansu, he took the decision to try and hold southern Sinkiang.

This decision brought the Kansu Muslims into direct conflict with the Uyghur Muslims of Sinkiang, their erstwhile allies. There had been indications of such a split for some time; as soon as fighting on the northern front had become bogged down before Urumchi, units of Ma’s forces had advanced into the Tarim Basin where his troops “alowed the antagonism of the Turki natives by looting and plundering” (Boorman and Howard, 464). It rapidly became clear to most of the Uyghur population (though notably not to Yulbars) that Ma was just another Kansu warlord, and not the saviour of the Muslims of Sinkiang they had hoped for. (There was never any question of Ma being viewed as a maddi, and there seems to be no reason for assuming that he considered himself as such. Nynman, 101-3, is certainly mistaken in suggesting this.)

The retreating Ma Chung-ying fell back on Koshgar, where he destroyed the nascent Islamic “East Turkestan Republic”; he then transferred command of his forces to his brother-in-law, Ma Hu-shan (Matthews, nos. 1310, 2165, 5670), and, in a move which still remains shrouded in mystery, crossed the frontier into the Soviet Union during July 1934. His brother-in-law, Ma Hu-shan, went on to occupy the whole of the southern rim of the Tarim Basin; here, as the “Commander-in-Chief of the 36th Division of the Kuomintang”, Ma established a strange Uighur-ruled fief on the borders of Tibet. Ma Hu-shan’s statelet, “Tunganistan” [g.v.] was to endure until 1937, when his forces melted away and he took refuge in British India.

It is not clear why Ma Chung-ying should have deliberately chosen to enter the Soviet Union when his military position was far from hopeless—after all, he had been driven back from Urumchi by Soviet forces. Ma’s eventual fate is uncertain; an article published anonymously in the Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society during 1935 states that he “died on arrival at Moscow”, however, it is more likely that he was held by Stalin as a weapon in reserve against Sheng Shih-ts’ai, the new warlord in Sinkiang. Ma has also been executed by Stalin at Sheng’s request when the latter visited Moscow in 1938; certainly, he was never seen again, though for many years stories of his imminent return circulated amongst both the Uyghurs of Sinkiang and the Hui of Kansu.


MA HUA-LUNG (Matthews' Chinese-English dictionary, Revised American edition 1969, characters nos. 4310, 2214, 4258), also known ma ch'ao-ying (Matthews', nos. 4310, 233, 1171), a Chinese Muslim leader and exponent of the "New Teaching" who played an important part in the great mid-13th/19th century Muslim risings against the Ch'ing dynasty.

Ma Hua-lung was born at an unknown date during the first half of the 13th/19th century, probably at Ch'in-chi-p'u (Hartmann, op. cit. in Bibl., 14), a walled city in Ninghsia (q.v.) province situated on the right bank of the Yellow River some 80 km. south of Ninghsia city (the modern Yinchuan). We know little of Ma's personal background. Po-ching-wei, member of the Shensi gentry who participated in the struggle against Ma (and therefore a hostile source), states that "Ma Hua-lung's family lived at Chin-chi-p'u for generations"; seemingly, Ma came from a well-to-do family background, for he was "the leading rich man in the area, as well as a person with a military title which he earned by substantial contributions to the government". Furthermore, he was a man of considerable political and religious significance, for Po tells us that he was "very much respected and trusted by the Moslems in Ninghsia ... and ... he was a sweeping influence over the Moslems of the other provinces too" (Po Ching-wei, Fung-hsi-ts'ao-lung-chi, iii, 7-11; cited in Chu, op. cit. in Bibl., 346-7).

In Ma Hua-lung's time, Chin-chi-p'u, said to have been a Muslim centre "for more than a thousand years" (Hartmann, op. cit. in Bibl., 278), and described as the "Medina of Chinese Islam" (Wright, op. cit. in Bibl., 111), indicating a significance secondary only to that of Hochoh (often described as the "Mecca of Chinese Islam"), was a prosperous trading centre which thrived on the tea and salt trade with Mongolia. Bales, 243, notes that "it was a purely Muslim city and no Chinese official was resident there. The officials lived at Lingchow" (a small city some 30 km. to the north).

Ma Hua-lung's lineage is unclear. He does not appear to have been directly related by blood to Ma Ming-hsin (q.v.) of An-ting, but he was certainly a spiritual descendant of the latter. Muhammad Tawādu'ī (op. cit. in Bibl., 117) states that he was the sixth šaykh of the Nakšbandī tariqa founded by Ma Ming-hsin ca. 1175/1761 near Lanchow. Ma Hua-lung's father, Ma Erh (Matthews', nos. 4310, 1751), the fifth šaykh in Ma Ming-hsin's silsilah, is said to have died "a lingering death" (Wright, 109) at the hands of the Chinese; Ma Hua-lung was thus both a spiritual and a direct blood descendant of Ma Erh, the fifth head of the Nakšbandiyya-Djabriyya order in Northwest China (see, however, Israel's 1974 thesis, 273-324, for an alternative analysis).

It seems that, after the harsh suppression of "New Teaching" adherents in the Kansu-Chinghai borderlands resulting from the defeat of the 1190/1781 and 1198/1783 Muslim risings, the surviving "New Teaching" leaders moved eastwards towards Ninghsia. According to Fletcher (op. cit. in Bibl., 77), it was Ma Hua-lung who made Chin-chi-p'u into the foremost "New Teaching" centre in all of China. From this basin he was able to exercise an influence on the Chinese umma far in excess of that wielded by Ma Ming-hsin during his prime, for during the three-quarters of a century following the death of the latter, the "New Teaching" had spread from the Kansu-Chinghai border area across much of China. Seemingly, Ma Hua-lung played an important part in this process of proselytisation, for in a memorial addressed to the Imperial authorities at Peking requesting the prohibition of the "New Teaching", Tso Tsung-t'ang, the Ch'ing commander who eventually crushed the 1862-78 Muslim rebellion in Northwest China, complained that Ma, who styled himself the Tsung-t'ia-kung ("General Grand Mullā", Matthews', nos. 692, 594, 1, 293), had "sent out people to spread this evil religion everywhere". According to Tso, these missionaries, known as hui-i-fei (Matthews', nos. 204, 385, 1850, possibly a corruption of the Arabic Suff term khāifa, see Israeli, op. cit., 1974, 298), were "disguised as businessmen" (Tso Tsung-t'ang, Memorials, cited in Chu, op. cit. in Bibl., 156-8). In fact, Muslim merchants dominated the North China caravan trade, and it is more than probable that many of the "New Teaching" hui-i-fei were also legitimate merchants. Tso continued: "According to the testimony of lately captured Muslim rebels, there are missionaries of the New Teaching in Peking, Tientsin, Heilungkiang, Kirin, Shansi and Hupeh" (Tso, Memorials, ibid.); it is also probable that the "New Teaching" had spread across Szechwan (where it was definitely established) to Yunnan (q.v.) where it may have played some part in the "Panthay" (q.v.) Muslim rebellion of Tu Wen-hsiu (q.v.).

During the great Muslim rebellion of 1862-78 (see AL-ŠIN), four main centres of Muslim power were to emerge in Northwest China (excluding only the Turkic areas of Sinkiang which were either to pass out of the rule of Ya'qūb Beg (q.v.) of Kāšghar (q.v.), or to maintain a precarious independence under incompetent local leadership in Dzungaria
MA MING-CHIN — MA WARÀ AL-NAHR

Chinese sources may be found in C. L. Pickens, Chinese annals, pp. 30-3 of his Annotated bibliography of literature on Islam in China, Hankow 1959; this source is especially useful for details of the 1196-9714 Muslim risings contained in the Ta-Ch'ing Kao-ssung Shun-huang-tsii shih-lu (i.e. the official edicts of the Ch'ien-lung period). See also Wei Yuan, Sheng-feng chi ("History of the Imperial wars"), 1842, chuan 7 (cited in Ford, op. cit. below). For further details, see D. J. Leslie, Islam in China to 1800: a bibliographical guide, in Abr-Nahrain, xvi (1976), 25 (Section H, "Imperial Edicts"). Further primary sources, including the Ping-Huai chi-lüeh ("Brief record of the pacification of the Muslims"), Kansu, ca. 1190/1781 may be found in Pui Shou-i, ed. Hsi-mei ch'i-i ("The righteous uprisings of the Muslim people"), published in 4 vols., Shanghai 1932, of which vols. iii and iv refer to events in the Chinese north-west during the 18th and 19th centuries.


More recent works include Mu-Shou-chi, Kung-Ning-Ch'ing shih-lüeh ("A brief history of Kansu, Ninghsia and Chinghali"), Lanchow 1956, chuan 18, p. 37; chuan 19, p. 6 etc. (cited in Ford, op. cit. below); in Arabic, Muhammed Tawâdû, al-Šin wa l-Islam, Cairo 1945; Pui-Shou-i, Hui-hui min-tsu i hsien-sheng ("The rebirth of the Muslim people"), Shanghai 1951, see esp. 46-7; Chu Wen-djang, The policy of the Manchu government in the suppression of the Muslim rebellion in Shensi, Kansu and Sinkiang from 1862 to 1878, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Washington, 1955 (the greater part of this thesis was later published [see Chu, 1966], but several important appendices were omitted from the published version, most notably Supplement IV, "Ma Hua-lang and the New Sect", which may be found at 343-60 of the unpublished thesis); Mary C. Wright, The last stand of Chinese conservatism: the Tung-Chi restoration, 1862-1874, Stanford 1957, see esp. 107-13 of the 1969 edition; L. J. Schram, The Mongols of the Kansu-Tibetan frontier, in Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, li/3 (1961), 63-5. A particularly important source is Saçgi-Tori's Jâhān-i jākûyā seki Higashi Torukusitan shakaisi kэнkyû ("The social history of Eastern Turkestan in the 18th/19th centuries"), Tokyo 1953. Also of importance is Emmanuel C. Y. Hsu's The Hui source: a study of Sinio-Russian diplomacy, 1781-1881, Oxford 1965, see esp. 23-4, and 197, n. B. The most recent sources include: Chu Wen-djang, The Muslim rebellion in Northwest China, 1862-78, The Hague-Paris 1966; J. Ford, Some Chinese Muslims of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in Asian Affairs, lixi N.S. vol. v/12 (1974), 144-56 (for Ma Ming-hsin, see esp. 153-8); R. Israeli, Chinese versus Muslims: a study of cultural confrontation, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of California, Berkeley 1974; J. Fletcher, Central Asian Sufism and Ma Ming-hsin's New Teaching, publication unknown, 1976 (?), 75-96; Israeli, Established Islam and marginal Islam in China: from eclecticism to syncretism, in JESHO, xx/1 (1978), 99-109.

MA WARÀ AL-NAHR (A.) "the land which lies beyond the river", i.e. beyond the Oxus or Anu-thâraya (q.v.), the channel of Transoxiana or Transoxanias, so-called by the conquering Arabs, of the 1st/7th century and after in contrast to Mâ dan-al-Nahr, the lands of Khurâsân (q.v.) this side of the Oxus, although the term Khurâsân was not infrequently used vaguely to designate all the eastern Islamic lands beyond western Persia.

1. THE NAME

The frontiers of Mâ warâ al-nahr on the north and east were where the power of Islam ceased and depended on political conditions; cf. the statements of the Arab geographers on Mâ warâ al-nahr in G. Le Strange, The lands of the Eastern Caliphate, Cambridge 1905, 433-4; W. Barthold, Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion, London 1928, 64 ff. The phrase Mâ warâ al-nahr passed from Arabic literature into Persian. As late as the 9th/15th century, Hâfiz-i Abru (q.v.) devotes a special chapter (the last) to Mâ warâ al-nahr in his geographical work. Under the influence of literary tradition, the phrase Mâ warâ al-nahr was used down to quite recent times in Central Asia itself (e.g. by Bâbur, in his Bâbur-nâmâ, ed. Derewsky, see index; by Mirzâ Haydar Dughlî later in the 19th/15th century in his Tahâr-i Rašhîd, tr. Elia and Ross, A history of the Moghuls, London 1855, 75 ff., 150 etc.; and by the Uzbek Muhammed Sâleh, cf. Sprâv. knizhka Samarkandskii oblasti, v. 240 and passim), although to the people of Central Asia the lands in question were on their side of and not across the river.

(W. BARTHOLOD)

2. HISTORY

Pre-Islamic Transoxanias comprised, in the widest sense, Sogdiana (Arabic Sâghîd [q.v.], essentially the basin of the Zarafshân river) and the lands as far as the Sir Dâryâ basin, north-westwards to Khâzârz (q.v.) and eastwards to Farghânâ (q.v.) and across the Tien Shan Mountains into Eastern or Chinese Turkestan (on the general concept of "Turkestan", Eastern and Western, see Türkistan). For these regions in classical times, see W. Tomaszek, in PW, ii, cols. 2804-13 (Baktra, Baktriane, Baktrianoi), iii, cols. 2406-8 (Chorasmia). All this was still largely an Iranian region, with such Middle Iranian languages flowing in his Tangâ-i Râshîd, London 1855, 75 ff., 150 etc.; and by the Uzbek Muhammed Sâleh, cf. Sprâv. knizhka Samarkandskii oblasti, v. 240 and passim), although to the people of Central Asia the lands in question were on their side of and not across the river. (W. BARTHOLOD)

Pre-Islamic Transoxania comprised, in the widest sense, Sogdiana (Arabic Sâghîd [q.v.], essentially the basin of the Zarafshân river) and the lands as far as the Sir Dâryâ basin, north-westwards to Khâzârz (q.v.) and eastwards to Farghânâ (q.v.) and across the Tien Shan Mountains into Eastern or Chinese Turkestan (on the general concept of "Turkestan", Eastern and Western, see Türkistan). For these regions in classical times, see W. Tomaszek, in PW, ii, cols. 2804-13 (Baktra, Baktriane, Baktrianoi), iii, cols. 2406-8 (Chorasmia). All this was still largely an Iranian region, with such Middle Iranian languages flowing in his Tangâ-i Râshîd, London 1855, 75 ff., 150 etc.; and by the Uzbek Muhammed Sâleh, cf. Sprâv. knizhka Samarkandskii oblasti, v. 240 and passim), although to the people of Central Asia the lands in question were on their side of and not across the river. (W. BARTHOLOD)
In regard to religion, no single faith was dominant. Buddhism was still in full blossom in Eastern Turkestania and still strong in the upper Oxus provinces, where it was the faith of the northern branch of the Hephthalites [see RAVATTA] who put up such a strenuous resistance to the Arabs in the later 1st/7th and early 2nd/8th centuries, and where Balkh [q.v.] was still a major Buddhist centre; but it had, for some time, been waning in Sogdia. When the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Huen-Tsang arrived in Samarkand in ca. 630, he found the Zoroastrians too, for he took in only have arrested this decline temporarily. For as in the linguistic field, cultural pressures from Sasanid Persia must have given Zoroastrianism an access of prestige and power in Transoxiana, even though direct Sasanid military authority did not extend beyond Marv (cf. W. Barthold, *Histoire des Tures d'Asie Centrale*, Paris 1945, 33). Manicheism and other dualist faiths were tolerated, and their adherents found an especially sympathetic haven in Eastern Turkestania and Upper India, as numerous surviving religious texts from the Tarim basin attest; as late as ca. 370/828 the *Huda'id al-Sulam*, tr. M. Norsky, London 1937, 115, § 25.13, records the presence in Samarkand of a conventual house of the Manicheans, *bihangāh-i Mināwiyān*, with audiatores or *nigāhkhān*. Mazdakites are mentioned also in Samarkand, and in the followers of the late 2nd/8th century heretic al-Mu'akna, the “wearers of white” (see below) were Mazdakites (or Manicheans?)—their adherents still persisted at Kish and Nahshib in the 1st century AD, according to Nasr al-Din Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Naṣr (Ta'rīkhī Buhkārā, 88-9, tr. 75). The Christian presence was strong. A bishop is mentioned at Marv in 334 A.D. and there was probably one in Samarkand by the 6th century. Nestorians, Jacobites and Melkites were all represented in Transoxiana. When the Sasanid *amir* Isma'iľ b. Ahmad [q.v.] conquered Talas in 280/893, a “great church” was transformed into a mosque (ibid., 102, tr. 86-7). The absence of any one preponderant faith meant that there did not exist in Transoxiana a dominant priesthood as there was in Sasanid Persia, though religious scholars (akbār: al-Tabari, ii, 1237) are mentioned in Khwarāzam at the time of Kutayba's incursions of 93/712, perhaps Zoroastrian priests; but resistance there to the Arabs was on grounds of local patriotism rather than on a religious basis. Socially, there was an influential class of merchants in such Soghdian towns as Bukhārā, Paykand and Samarkand, which was involved in long-distance trade operations with the Turkish peoples of the Siberian steppes and with the Chinese. The Arab invasions would not seriously hamper these trade movements, and indeed, the Soghdian merchants eventually found new markets within the Islamic caliphate for the goods which they imported from Inner Asia. The landed aristocracy of dīkhana was dominant in the countryside and smaller towns, and the pattern of large estates in Khwarāzam, along the Otris channels and their canals, revealed by Soviet archaeology, was probably repeated in the irrigated lands of the Zarafshān valley and the upper Oxus ones. The local Iranian princes of Transoxiana mentioned in the sources, such as those in rural Ilak [q.v. in Suppl.], *Shāh* [q.v.] and Farghāna, and in cities like Samarkand and Bukhārā, comprised the more powerful members of the dīkhan class and bore Iranian regnal titles such as *shāhād* [q.v.] from Old Persian *mādāhāthāya*—"king, ruler"—, e.g. in Soghdia and Farghāna. Such a land-owning class (which may be called, not anachronistically, one of feudal magnates) of dīkhan was the backbone of resistance to the Arabs, and continued to play a leading social role—eventually as an Islamicate caste—in Transoxania till the end of the Sasanid period, during which political authority was still to a considerably extent decentralised; its decline only came with the influx of Turkish steppe peoples in the 5th/11th century and after.

The Arabs who had invaded Persia and overthrown the Sasanid empire penetrated to Turkapistan in *Ujjamān's caliphate*, during the governorship in Khurāsān of Abū Abd Allah b. *Amīr* [q.v.], and al-Baladhuri, *Futūḥ*, 408, records, on the authority of Abū ʿUbayda, a plunder raid across the Oxus to Māyūrgh near Samarkand in 33/653-4. It would have been obviously unwise to commit major Arab forces across the river until some progress had been made against the resistance of the Hephthalites in Cissoxania and until a key point like Balkh had been captured (first raided in 34/653, but not fully secured until the time of Kutayba, see below) and the Oxus crossing-points of Arvand Shāft [q.v.] and Zamm taken.

In the spring of 54/664 Mu'awiyah's general ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād [q.v.] crossed the Oxus, attacked Paykand and defeated the army of the local Soghdian ruler of Bukhārā, the Bukhārī Khudā. Yazīd I's governor, Salm b. Ziyād (61-4/682-3) was the first Arab commander actually to winter across the river. Any hopes of Arab progress in Transoxiana were dashed by the civil wars which broke out in the heart of the empire at this time, the caliphate of Narsakkīb Abū Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Naṣr (Ta'rīkhī Buhkārā, 88-9, tr. 75). The Christian presence was strong. A bishop is mentioned at Marv in 334 A.D. and there was probably one in Samarkand by the 6th century. Nestorians, Jacobites and Melkites were all represented in Transoxiana. When the Sasanid *amir* Isma'iľ b. Ahmad [q.v.] conquered Talas in 280/893, a “great church” was transformed into a mosque (ibid., 102, tr. 86-7). The absence of any one preponderant faith meant that there did not exist in Transoxiana a dominant priesthood as there was in Sasanid Persia, though religious scholars (akbār: al-Tabari, ii, 1237) are mentioned in Khwarāzam at the time of Kutayba's incursions of 93/712, perhaps Zoroastrian priests; but resistance there to the Arabs was on grounds of local patriotism rather than on a religious basis. Socially, there was an influential class of merchants in such Soghdian towns as Bukhārā, Paykand and Samarkand, which was involved in long-distance trade operations with the Turkish peoples of the Siberian steppes and with the Chinese. The Arab invasions would not seriously hamper these trade movements, and indeed, the Soghdian merchants eventually found new markets within the Islamic caliphate for the goods which they imported from Inner Asia. The landed aristocracy of dīkhana was dominant in the countryside and smaller towns, and the pattern of large estates in Khwarāzam, along the Otris channels and their canals, revealed by Soviet archaeology, was probably repeated in the irrigated lands of the Zarafshān valley and the upper Oxus ones. The local Iranian princes of Transoxiana mentioned in the sources, such as those in rural Ilak [q.v. in Suppl.], *Shāh* [q.v.] and Farghāna, and in cities like Samarkand and Bukhārā, comprised the more powerful members of the dīkhan class and bore Iranian regnal titles such as *shāhād* [q.v.] from Old Persian *mādāhāthāya*. It was the great Kutayba b. Muslim al-Bahlī [q.v.] who was the first Arab general to establish a firm Arab hold over Transoxiana. Appointed governor of the east by al-Hajjāj in 86/705, he was to endure the caliphate of al-Walid b. ʿAbd al-Malik, a reign particularly significant for the extension of Muslim power in both east and west. Kutayba first campaigned successfully in the Upper Oxus provinces at the invitation of the ruler of Ḥaṃānī, who sought aid against local rivals (86/705). Between 85/706 and 90/709 he conquered Paykand and Bukhārā, installing in the latter city a local prince Toghshada as his vassal, and received the submission of Tarkhan of Samarkand and his successor Ghrārak. Mosques were now built in Bukhārā, Samarkand, etc., in order to encourage the implantation of Islam and the inhabitants of Bukhārā were forced to give up half the houses of the *madina* or *shahrastān* as billets for the incoming Arab garrison; but according to Narsakkīb, 57, tr. 48, Kutayba had to pay the local inhabitants two *dirhams* a time to attend the Friday prayers. It was first in 88/709 that Kutayba had to repel Turkish forces who appeared in Transoxiana when the people of Bukhārā appealed to the powerful Kaghaz of the Eastern Turks, whose name is known only in the Chinese transcription of Mo-ch'ü; and a further Turkish invasion into Sogdīa in 93/712, at the invitation of the people of Samarkand, repulsed by Kutayba in the following year, may be that mentioned in the early Turkish Orchkon inscriptions (Khočo-Tasād, Kültīgīn 1:39) as the one undertaken by
the prince Kūltigin which penetrated as far as Tāmir Kāfshān, the "Iron Gate" (so the present Bugznīa defile between Kīsh and Tūrānshahr), "in order to organise the Sogdian people" (the connection of these seems fairly certain, as proposed by Marquart and Barthold; cf. R. Giraud, L'empire des Turcs cèlestes, les rôles d'Eltcherich, Qaqphan et Bishāq [680-734], Paris 1960, 44, 182-3, who also notes that this same inscription (Kūltigin I, E 31) mentions an earlier expedition to the Iron Gate under Tūrānshahr in 701). Kutayba further sent two expeditions against Kūrāzām in 931/2, when the Kūrāzām-Shāh was killed, although it was long before Islam became firmly implanted there (see Gīb, op. cit.). His forces also campaigned in the Sir Darya valley in ʿUghrāsrān [q.v.] and Shāh, meeting no resistance from the Turks, although the brief report in al-Tabarī, ii, 1276, of a raid by one of his commanders as far as Kāshgar, on the other side of the Tien Shan, seems improbable (see H. A. R. Gibb, The Arab invasion of Kāshgar in A.D. 715, in BSOS, ii [1923], 467-74).

The Turks' ability to intervene once more in Transoxanian affairs was for a while hampered by internal disputes between the Eastern and Western Turks, but after 716, a forceful ruler, Su-lu, made himself leader of the Western Turks or Tūrēghe. In 720-1 he inflicted a sharp defeat, the so-called "Day of thirst", on the Arab commander Saʿīd b. ʿAmr al-Ḥaṭrābī who had invaded Fārghāna, in the Sir Darya basin, and this reduced aggressive activity on the part of the Arabs for a decade or two. It is from these years, immediately after the fall of Kutayba, that there dates the important cache of documents in Sogdian, the archives of Divistīc, prince of Pandjikent on the upper reaches of the Zarafshān, kept at his stronghold on Mount Mugh, sacked in 1047/22-3 by the Arabs (al-Tabarī, ii, 1447-8; cf. A. L. Mongoldt, Archäologie in the U.S.S.R., Moscow 1959, 289-95). In the ensuing years, the Arabs, now on the defensive, were pushed back by the joint efforts of the Sogdian princes and the Turks, so that by 116/728 the Arabs only held Samarkand and Dābūsiyāra. The Arabs themselves were divided after 116/734, when the rebellion of al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī al-Muqadhshī [q.v.] broke out, first in Tūrgartān and then in Transoxania (where al-Ḥārīth allied with the Kağdan of the Tūrēghe, Su-lu), lasting for several years. There was also much unrest among the indigenous Transoxanian population which had been converted to Islam but which nevertheless found itself still liable to pay the poll-tax for the benefit of the Arab treasury.

Arab fortunes only revived under the energetic and experienced—he had fought under Kutayba—governor Nasr b. Sāyyār al-Kūnānī [q.v.] (120-30/738-49), who made a generous financial settlement for the new converts and for those inhabitants who had apostatised from Islam when Arab military control had been relaxed and looked like disappearing altogether, and who brought al-Ḥārīth b. Suraydī to terms in 126/744. He carried Arab arms into Fārghāna again, but spent most of his efforts in pacifying Sogdiana and in conciliating its people. Arab embassies to the Chinese court were resumed by Nasr after an hiatus in the period 115-23/733-41, and the regulation of commercial contacts may have been one of the motives involved (see Gīb, Chinese records of the embassies of the Arabs in Central Asia, in BSOS, ii [1923], 619-22).

Nasr was forced to abandon both Transoxania and Kūrāzām by the growing menace of the ʿAbbāsīd daʿwa under ʿAbbās Muslim [q.v.], and the ʿAbbāsids governors were installed in the East from 130/748 onwards. This internal revolution amongst the Arabs must have been welcomed by the dīhās of Transoxania, disturbed at the wastage of their political and social influence through the increased momentum of conversions to Islam. In 133/750-1 there was, moreover, a pro-ʿAlī rising among the Arab garrison of Bukhārā, bloodily suppressed by the new ʿAbbāsīd governor Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ al-Khūzāfī [q.v.]. Although the Bukhārī-Khūzāfī had co-operated with the Arab authorities against the insurgents, he was afterwards executed on Abu Muslim's orders.

Meanwhile, the dissensions into which the Tūrēghe steppe confederation had fallen in 738 with Su-lu's defeat in battle at the hands of the Chinese and his assassination by a rival Turkish chief, permitted a recreation, now on a scale much more threatening than ever before to the Arabs, of Chinese activity in Central Asia. In 748 Chinese forces captured the Tūrēghe capital of Sūyūb, in the Ču river valley to the north-east of Fārghāna, and in 749 executed the local ruler of Shāh for "the non-fulfilment of his duties as a vassal". For several decades, virtually since the first coming of the Arabs, the Sogdian princes and the princes of Tūrgartān (including among the latter the Yaḥyāḥi, Arabic Ḍabbābīyā) had been sending embassies to China appealing for help against the invaders. Now in 750-1 the Korean general Kār-hsan-chīn was sent by the Chinese governor of Ḫūrūn in Eastern Turkestan, firstly against rebels in the Pamirs region of Gilgit [q.v. in Suppl.], and then into Fārghāna. Here the Chinese army, assisted by the Turkish Karīḵ [q.v.], met an Arab force under Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ at Ahlakh or Aṭlahk near Talas in 133/751, and was soundly defeated, with heavy losses of killed and captured (see D. M. Dunlop, A new source of information on the Battle of Talas or Aṭlahk, in Uralto-Asiatische Jahrbücher, xxxvi [1965], 326-30). Amongst these prisoners of war were Chinese artisans who are supposed to have taught the people of Samarkand the art of paper-making [al-Thālūbī, Lajāʿīf al-maʿāṣirī, tr. Bosworth, The book of curious and entertaining information, Edinburgh 1968, 140, and Kāqhad]. This marked the end of Chinese attempts to assert their hegemony west of the Tien-Shan; to the subsequent treaties of the Iranian princes of Transoxania and Kūrāzām for help against the Arabs, the Tʻang emperors, pre-occupied by succession quarrels 753-63, were compelled to return non-committal answers. Arab authority was thus made reasonable firm in Transoxania for the first time, since the local potentates no longer had any strong allies either in the Turkish steppes (the Eastern Turkish confederation had collapsed with the death of the Ḫāgin Mo-kil-lien in 744, to be replaced by that of the Uyghurs, who were essentially concerned with Mongolia and Eastern Turkestan) or in the Far East. That the masses of population in Transoxania were as yet far from wholly reconciled to Arab political and social domination was to be demonstrated by various outbreaks of religio-political protest in the early ʿAbbāsīd period (see further on these, below), but Arab authority was by that time never seriously jeopardised.

For the detailed history of this first century or so of Arab domination in Transoxania, see F. H. Skrine and D. D. Ross, The heart of Asia, a history of Russian Turkestan and the Central Asian khansates from the earliest times, London 1899, 34-89; Gīb, The Arab conquests in Central Asia, London 1923; Barthold, Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale, 47 ff.

Under the first Abbāsids, Transoxania gradually became integrated politically as a province of the caliphate as a whole. The first governors appointed there by the victorious Abū Muslim speedily began intriguing against their patron at the instigation of the caliph Abū ‘Abbās al-Saffah, who became deeply suspicious of his over-mighty subject. Abū Muslim accordingly executed Sibī b. al-Nu‘mān al-Azīzī in 135/752-3 at Amul, whilst the fugitive Ziyād b. Sāliḥ was executed, to Abū Muslim’s satisfaction, by the Iranian dhikhrī of Dārākhsh, on the route from Samarkand to Ugrisrāna. Discontent among Abū Muslim’s own followers after his death at the caliph al-Mansūr’s hands in 137/755, discontent which came to regard the murdered leader as a semidivine, messianic figure who would return and establish a reign of justice (cf. G.-H. Sadighi, Les mouvements religieux transiens au IIe et au IIIe siècle de l’Hégire, Paris 1938, 134 ff.), united sectarian Islamic and non-Islamic religious dissent with political-sectarian resentment at Arab domination; these combined strands made Transoxania a much-troubled region in the ensuing decades. The rapidly-changing series of Arab governors sent out to govern Khūrāsān and Transoxania (see the list in Zambaur, Manuel, 48) were mostly intent on lining their own pockets during their expected brief tenure of power there rather than on trying to bring about a community of interest between the Arab central government representatives and the local populations. Several governors debased the local silver currency, although it is favourably recorded by Nāṣirīkhānī that the governor Ghiṣṭīrī b. ʿAtṣā [q.v. in Suppl.], appointed to Khūrāsān in 175/791 by his own nephew Hārūn al-Raṣūlī, introduced the useful reform of alloy dārāhams, called Ghiṣṭīrī, to replace the old, largely-vanished coinage of the Bukhārī-Khūdās (see Barthol., Turkestân, 203-5).

Most of what we know about Transoxania’s specific history in this period from the advent of the ‘Abbāsids to the time of the Sāmānids is concerned with various rebellions there. In the caliphate of al-Mahdī, ca. 159-60/776-7 and during the governorships of Hunayn b. Kāhtaba al-Tāṣī and Abū ‘Awīn ‘Abd al-Malik b. Yazīd, there occurred the outbreak of the Khāridjī muallā Yūsuf al-Barm al-Thaqāfī at Bukhārā and in the countryside of Bādghīs, and later, in the time of al-Ma‘mūn, Yūsuf’s grandson Mansūr b. ‘Abd Allāh also rebelled; such Khāridjī activity was an aspect of the general vitality of Khāridjī doctrines in Khūrāsān and Sīstān at this period. More serious at the time and with a protracted aftermath was the movement of the “wearers of white garments” (al-mubayyiyā, ispīd-dājamānī), followers of the “veiled prophet” al-Mu‘izzānna [q.v.], whose real name was Hūshim b. Ḥakīm or ‘Atṣā, a former partisan of Abū Muslim’s. The revolt, erupting during Hunayn’s governorship, is treated at length by Nāกระkihī (77-89, tr. 65-76; Barthol., Turkestân, 198-200; Sadighi, op. cit., 76-86; B. S. Amoretti, Sects and heretics, in Camb. hist. of Iran. ‘iv. From the Arab invasion to the Saljuqs, ed. R. N. Frye, Cambridge 1975, 498-501). It attracted widespread support in Sogdīa, at Khīkh and at Nakhshab or Nasaf, whilst in Bukhārā, the son of the Bukhārī-Khūdā Tughbāhāda, Bunywāt, renounced official Islam and joined the movement. It is not easy to discern from the sources the exact nature of al-Mu‘izzānna’s religious doctrines. He himself may have been originally a Zoroastrian, but his ideas may have come to include neo-Mazdakite elements and perhaps even Manichaean ones; and certainly, Abū Muslim, whose avatar al-Mu‘izzānna claimed to be, was accorded an exalted, almost divine position. The outbreak was suppressed during the governorship of al-Muṣayyab b. Zuhayr al-Dāhī (163-6/780-6), but the “wearers of white garments” persisted in several areas of Transoxania and Khūrāsān for at least two centuries after this. The years 171-4/886-9 were characterised by the revolt centred on Transoxania, but with partisans joining his standard from the upper Oxus provinces of Ćugānjiyān and Khuttal and from Khārazm, of Rāst b. Layth, the grandson of Naṣr b. Sayyār. The motive behind this seems to have been purely personal, without any religious or ideological impulse, and doubtless the prestige of Rāst’s descent from the popular Naṣr b. Sayyār brought him support. The Arab governor of Samarkand was killed, and Rāst secured help from the Iranian prince of Sāmān, from the Karluk and the Togluq-网络游戏 Turks of the steppes and from Tibet before he submitted voluntarily to al-Ma‘mūn and secured pardon (see Barthol., Turkestân, 200-1).

Thus intervention by the Turks in Transoxanian affairs continued during the early ‘Abbāsids period, but not on the same scale as during the Umayyad one. The disintegration of the Tūrgesh power in the Western Turkestān steppes was followed by the ascendency of the Togluq-网络游戏, precursors of the Ughuz or Qhuza [q.v.] who are mentioned in the 4th/8th and 5th/9th century Islamic sources as harrying the borders of Sāmānī Transoxania and then emerging to form the tribal backing of the Sādghās [q.v.] when they overthrew Ghaznawī power in Khūrāsān and entered northern Persia and the central lands of the Middle East. In the early ‘Abbāsids period, the Togluq-网络游戏 had their pasture grounds on the confines of Khārazm and also along the lower Sir Darāy. The Karluk, possibly the ancestors of the later Ilek Khūnās [q.v.] or Karakhanīs, took the eastern Sir Darāy basin and Somadīyeh (Turkīsh Yeti Su, “the land of the seven rivers”), acquiring in 766 Sīyāb, the former capital of the Tūrgesh. Islamic Transoxania suffered sporadically from their incursions, and these Turks continued also to give help on occasion to insurgent local Iranian princes and to rebels like Rāst b. Layth. To protect the settled agricultural lands, walls were built to the north of Bukhārā and in Shāsh; in Jā‘k, in the great southern bend of the Sir Darāy, the construction of a wall from the mountains to the river is ascribed to ‘Abd Allāh b. Humayd b. Kāhtaba, governor of Khūrāsān in 159/776 after his father’s death. As shows of strength, the Arabs periodically sent expeditions into Farghāna; Ghiṣṭīrī b. ‘Atṣā sent thither an army to drive out the forces of the Yabgu of the Karluk, and Faḍl b. Yābyd al-Barmakī (177-9/793-5) exacted the submission of the Afšīn or prince of Ugrisrāna, who according to Gardizi, had never before acknowledged the supremacy of any outside ruler. The caliph al-Mahdī received at one point the homage of various Central Asian rulers, amongst whom are mentioned the Khāṣḥī of Sogdīa, the Afšīn of Ugrisrāna, the prince of Farghāna, the Yabgu of the Karluk, the Kaghān of the Togluq-网络游戏, etc., but this cannot have meant much in practice. This was also a period when, because of the early ‘Abbāsids’ dependence on their Khūrāsānī guards, Transoxanian fighting men entered the caliphal army in considerable numbers; in the reign
of al-Mu'tasim, the Aflah of Ushrusana, Haydor, was to play a leading role in suppressing the revolt of Bābak al-Khurrāmī [g.v.] in northwestern Persia until his own spectacular fall in 256/871 (see APSM1). Of special concern to us here is the contemporary rise to power, under the overlordship of the Tahirids, of the Sāmānids, who laid the foundations for which was a powerful antecedent, at first in Transoxana and then also, in the 4th/10th century, in Khurāsān (204-359/819-1009). Whether the semi-mythical ancestor of the Sāmānids, the person given the title of Sāmān-Khūdā, was really a scion of the Sāsānids or not (see Bosworth, The heritage of rulership in early Islamic Iran and the search for dynastic connections with the past, in Iran, JHIPS, xi [1973], 39-9) is impossible to decide, but the family was clearly a typical Iranian diwān one hailing from Tukhhrāstān. A Sāmān-Khūdā of the late Umayyad period is said to have accepted Islam at the hands of the governor Asad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kasrī (103-97/ 724-37), and in the caliphate of al-Mu'tamīn, his four grandsons, Ahmad, Yahyā, and Iyās received as rewards for their fidelity to al-Mu'tamīn’s interests, the governorships of Samarkand, Farghānā, Shāshāh and Harāt respectively. The Harāt branch was unable to maintain power south of the Oxus, and the Sāmānids developed essentially as the dominant power in Transoxana, being designated governors, in effect independent rulers there, by the caliph in 261/875 after the downfall of the Tahirids at the hands of the Ṣaffārids Ya'qūb b. ʿAmr b. Layḥ [g.v.]. For a detailed consideration of the Sāmānī dynasty and its history, see Sāmānids, and for the present, a useful general survey by Frye, ʿThe Sāmānids, in Camb. hist. of Iran, iv, 136-61.

Here it may merely be noted that it was a cardinal feature of Sāmānī policy, from the time of the real founder of the dynasty’s fortunes, Ismāʿīl b. Ahmad (279-95/892-907) [g.v.], onwards, to maintain those frontiers of Transoxana which faced the steppes against the pagan Turks and thereby to provide a bastion against nomadic pressure from Inner Asia. Ahmad b. Ahmad b. Harūn, in 283-93/ 900-10 the sāmānī ‘expedition against the Karūkīs, taking an immense plunder (presumably of beasts and slaves) from them at Talas (modern Dzhabul), and he also brought to heel the prince of Ushrusana. Other outlying Iranian principalities were however normally allowed to subsist as vassals, sending tribute and/or presents to the amīrs, of the Sāmānids. This was the case with the Afrīghīdū Khwārazm-Shāhān, the ʿAffāridūs in Sīstān, the Farāhghūnūs in Gūzān, the Ābū Dāwūdūs in Bakhch, the Muḥtadīūs in Caghāniyūn, etc., and whilst the amīrs remained vigorous and incisive, this was no source of weakness. Contemporary geographers describe the fringes of Transoxana as dotted with ribāds [g.v.] against the pagan Karūkīs, Oghuz and Kūmāk [g.v.], where ghādārī or enthusiasts for the faith, from the Transoxanian towns, could work off their energies in the defence of Islam. In Isfīḥāb [g.v. in Suppl.,] on the northernmost frontier of Islam, as many as 2,700 ribāds are mentioned, partly manned by voluntary recruitment from Nakhshab, Buhkharā and Samar- kand. Even when some of these Turks had been nominally converted to Islam, ribāds as centres for offensive and defensive operations were still necessary; al-Muṣṭafāzādā, 274, tells how two places on the middle Šr Dārāyā, in the district of Isfīḥāb, were frontier points (haṣālātān) against the Türkmen (al-Turkmenīyūtron) who had only become Muslims “out of fear”. It was also from these frontier-posts that Sīfīs and other zealots set off into the terrā inequitas of the steppes as evangelists, such as the missionary from Nāshābīyūn, one Abu ʿAbī-Hasan Muḥammad al-Kalīmī, who worked amongst the Karūkīs in the middle years of the 4th/10th century and who played some part in the conversion of the founder of the Karakhāndīn line, Satuq Bughrā Khwān, the Islamic ʿAbī al-Karīm (Bartholin, Turkestan, 173-5, 254-6). Transoxana flourished under the Sāmānids, and there was a dying-down of sectarian religious and socio-political protest movements during their time, compared with the previous period, although these did not entirely disappear. The geographers and travellers praise the ease of life there, the plentifulness of provisions, the comparatively light hand of government and incidence of taxation and tolls. There was quite a complex central administration in the capital Buhkharā, known to us from the accounts of Nāshābīyūn and of the encyclopaedist of the sciences Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Khūraṣānī [g.v.], with a cluster of diwāns or government departments adjacent to the palace built in Bukhara by Nasr b. Ahmad (331-32/943-4); the model for these was doubtless the ʿAbbāsīd bureaucracy in Baghdād (see Nāshābīyūn, 31-2, tr. 25-7; Bosworth, Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Khūraṣānī on the technical position of the secretary’s ari . . . , in JESHO, xii [1969], 113-64). Because of the province’s frontier position, the people of Transoxana are described as tough, bellicose and self-reliant; also, perhaps because of the continued social influence of the diwān class, the ancient Iranian virtues of hospitality and liberality were kept up (see Bosworth, The ʿAffāridūs, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 949-1040 (Edinburgh 1963, 27-34). Culturally, both the Sāmānids themselves and the local, petty courts of the empire encouraged the persistence of Iranian oral and literary traditions, seen in the birth and florescence of New Persian lyrical and heroic poetry (by Shāhīd Balkhī, Ṣūrākī, Daḵīfī, etc.) which characterised the 4th/10th century and prepared the way in the early part of the following century for such figures as Firdawsi and the Ghaznavīd G. Lazard, The rise of the New Persian language, in Camb. hist. of Iran, iv, 595-632). At the same time, Transoxana shared to the full in the Arab-Islamic heritage of the caliphate as a whole. Several of the compilers of the canonical collections of ḥadīth, the sunan, were from Transoxana and Khūraṣān, and their scholars played a large role in the consolidation and elaboration of orthodox Sunnī theology (kalām) and law (fīqā). Similarly, the fourth section of al-Thaʾālibī’s literary anthology, the Yalīmuṭ al-dahr, shows how brilliantly Arabic poetry and artistic prose were cultivated in Khūraṣān, Transoxana and Khvārazm (see V. Danner, Arabic literature in Iran, in Camb. hist. of Iran, iv, 566-94; Bosworth, The interaction of Arabic and Persian culture in the 10th and early 11th centuries, in al-Abhāth, xxvii [1978-9], 60, 68 ff.).

As in other fields, during the period 750-1000 Transoxana acquired strong economic and commercial links with the heartlands of the caliphate, including with the supreme centre of commerce and trade, Baghdad, and its capital Baghīdād. Instead of the old military systems of the Arab muḥā.ltına and then of the early ʿAbbāsīd’s Khwāraṣānīn guards, the caliphs began in the 3rd/9th century to surround themselves with Turkish slave troops [see DAVAH and GULÂM]. Hence the trade in Turkish slaves, who passed from the Inner Asian steppes through Transoxana into the slave markets there, became highly important, Turkish slaves were an integral part of the annual
tribute which the Tahirids, whose governorate involved responsibility for Transoxania, forwarded to Baghdad; according to Ibn Khurram al-Dhibi, 28, 290 in the year after, their value amounted to 600,000 dirhams. In the Sāmānid period, a century or so later, al-Mu'addasī, 340, states that the Sāmānid government issued special licenses (adjwīra) for the transit across their lands of Turkish slave boys and collected dues for them at the Oxus crossings. The detailed list of the products of the Inner Asian steppes, the Siberian forest zone and the Volga basin given by idem, 323-6, has been conveniently translated by Barthold, Turkestän, 235-6. Transoxania and Khūraṣān processed and sewed together the furs of the forest lands, these being highly-prized, luxury articles in Islam [see Dżawar], and were important centres for the manufacture of cotton and other textiles. Particularly mentioned are the silks and satin brocades of Samarkand; the towels of Karāmīyā; the cloth of the village of Zandana, near Buḫbārā used for the livery of the Sāmānids' palace guards; the cottons of Ta'wāvis, also near Buḫbārā; and the cotton garments of Waḫān near Samarkand. Nārāshqāhī, 24, tr. 19-20, mentions a fiṣlār [g.v.] factory (kārgāh) in Buḫbārā, where carpets, cloth, etc. were woven for the caliphs and which were also exported as far as Syria, Egypt and Byzantium; it may have been founded when al-Ma'mūn was governor in Marv, but by Nārāshqāhī's time (or by that of his contemporaries) it was no longer in use (see R. B. Serjeant, Islamic textiles, material for a history up to the Mongol conquest, Beirut 1972, 92-100). Another luxury item which came into the caliphate, certainly by sea but also probably overland through Central Asia and Transoxania, was Chinese porcelain, including the "imperial" variety, ānī faghlār as the Ghaznavid historian Abu 'l-Fadl Bayhaḵī calls it, imported in the time of Hārūn al-Raschīd (see P. Kahle, Chinese porcelain in the lands of Islam, in Opera minora, Leiden 1956, 354); whilst from Khāßerāz, the local bīrāŋẕ melons were so coveted as to be exported for al-Ma'mūn and al-Wāḏīk in leaden containers packed with snow (al-Thālibī, tr., The book of curious and interesting information, 142).

The direct interest of the caliphs and their ministers in Central Asia, as well as being seen in the bāyi al-fīrāz at Buḫbārā, to which the caliphs' tax-collectors each year to collect the stipulated taxation of the city in textiles, is paralleled by the fact, mentioned by Ibn Farāhin, that in the opening years of the 4th/10th century, the caliph al-Muqtadir's vizier Ibn al-Furāt [g.v.] had an extensive estate at Artaḵshumgilān in Khūraṣān, administered by a local Christian steward or vakil (Reisebericht, ed. A. Z. V. Togan, Leipzig 1939, § 7, text 3-4, tr. 2-3, and Exкурса 52, 110-11).

The increasingly acute internal divisions within the Sāmānids amirate of the later 4th/10th centuries, when powerful Turkish emperors like the Sūnibs, Fātids and Buḫtārs secured an ascendancy in the state, making and unmaking aminis at will, and when an internal financial crisis, bringing sharp increases in taxation, manifested itself, heralded the fall of the dynasty. The decisive factor here was the appearance on the northern frontiers of Transoxania, now unguarded, of the Kariḳū. The Kariḳū were converted to Islam in 339/950, and from their centres at Kāhirkhāna and Bāzār (g.v.) (the latter in the Oxus valley, perhaps near modern Frunze) began to take advantage of the amirate's weakness. Apparently with some encouragement—as, in former times, against the Arab governors—from the local

Iranian dīhshān, the Karliḳ temporarily occupied the capital Buḫbārā in 384/992. Further incursions followed, and in the end, the Karakhānsids, as the rulers finally of the Karliḳ begins to be called, divided up the Sāmānids dominions with Maḥmūd of Ghazna [g.v.], the Karakhānsids taking Transoxania and the Ghaznavids Khūraṣān (see Barthold, Turkestän, 246-71; idem, Histoire des Tûres d'Asie Centrale, 59 ff.; Grousset, L'empire des steppes, 198-203).

For a detailed account of the political and dynastic changes in Transoxania over the next two centuries or so before the coming of the Mongols, see IEK, for the next wave of Inner Asian peoples to enter Sīrīsche and Transoxania, the Kitai [Chinese] Kī-tan or Liang from the Mongolian fringes of northern China, see Kārā Khiṭāb; and since the history of the Great Saljuqs, successors of Transoxania in the sultanates of Malik-Shah and Sanchar [g.v.], impinges on that of Transoxania, see further Saljuqs.

The long-term political, social and ethnic effects of the installation of Turkish and Mongol peoples like these in Transoxania were profound. The pastoralisation of the land outside the oases and irrigated river valleys may have begun in the Kāhirkhān period, since we know about royal hunting-grounds (gūranūba) being set up. The process certainly took effect under the Mongol Caghatayids and the Timurids, when urban life declined in the province after the savage sackings of towns by the Mongols in the 7th/13th century. Political authority was now decentralised, with tribally-organised nomadic confederations, often without firmly-fixed capitals, directing affairs, instead of the centralising states and autocratic rulers of the Perso-Islamic tradition. This is, indeed, one aspect of the fact that with the fall of the Sāmānids, the ancient basin which had for centuries protected the Iranian and Middle Eastern heartlands from the incursions of steppe peoples was now removed. Transoxania became a corridor of entry for these hordes—Karakhānsids, Saljuqs, Mongols, etc.—until the advent of the Şafavids in Persia, who, though themselves of Turkmen stock, constituted a powerful and resolute barrier state which increasingly had the advantages of better firearms and military techniques [see below, v], which could accordingly withstand the attacks of the Şaybānids Uzbeks or Özbegs and others from across the Oxus and the Atrek.

But by this time, i.e. the 10th/16th century, the passing of the previous five or six centuries had almost completely accomplished the process of ethnic and linguistic Turkicisation in Transoxania and Khūraṣān, the old "Iran extérieur". The continued influx of Turks gradually swamped the Iranians or Taḏjiks [g.v.], as the Turks called them, and the population became mixed, with the Turkic element emerging uppermost, as it also did eventually at the other end of the modern Turkish world, i.e. in Āḏharbāḏjān and Anatolia. It was the same in regard to language. It is unclear exactly when the Şoghdian died out, but this must have been roughly contemporaneous with the fall of the Sāmānids; and the New Persian which had been replacing Şoghdian during the Sāmānid period subsequently vanished also from most of Transoxania. In Khūraṣān, Turkicisation began in Saljuq times, although the indigenous Iranian languages persisted until the 8th/14th century (see Barthold, Histoire des Tûres d'Asie Centrale, 109-10).

Only in the upper Oxus regions of what were the
medieval provinces of Çaghlānīyān, Khūṭtal and Wākhsī did an Iranian-speaking population persist now speaking the form of New Persian known as Tadhik/Tadhikh (see Iran. ii. Linguages, in Suppl.), and living in what is now the Tadhik SSR, their numbers amounting to under 3/4 million (1970 census). It is also during these centuries of the Turkicisation of Transoxania that the region becomes known, at least in popular parlance, as Turkistan [q.v.].

Transoxania and Eastern Turkestān or Kāshgharīa were of course the first Islamic lands which Čingiz Kūn encountered when he came westwards with the Mongol hordes. Bālāsāghūn [q.v.], the main urban centre of Semirečye, was occupied after it had already suffered a severe plundering by the Karā Kūšīā. Buḫūrān was ravaged in 616/1220, and soon afterwards, Ōtrār or Ūtrār [q.v.], the former Fārāb [q.v.], in the Sfb Dārāy basin, and Sāmarḵān were attacked before Čingiz pushed on into Khorāsān in pursuit of the Khārāzim-Shah Ādī al-Dīn Muhammad [see Khārāzim-Shah]. Gūrgāndj [q.v.] in Khārāzim was bravely defended, but fell to the Mongols (618/1221) and was later named Urgench. The great Khān Īq̄eyd (1227-41) appointed governors in Transoxania for Nāḵshab, Buḫūrān and Sāmarḵān, and the sedentary indigenous population was at the beginning of his reign ruled by his representative Māhūd Yalawac Khārāzīm [q.v.], appointed to collect the taxation there. Ǧūowāyni praises Māhūd Yalawac’s just rule and that also of his son Masʿūd Beg [q.v.], stating that Buḫūrān reached its former level of prosperity (the latter governor was, for instance, the founder of the Masʿūdīyāna madrasa in Buḫūrān), though in fact there was a popular, anti-Mongol rebellion there led by one Māhūd Tārābī, only ended by the appearance of a large Mongol army (636/1238-9) (see Barthold, Turkestān, 381-519; Groussot, L’empire des steppes, 293 ff., 324-8; Hamblen, The career of Čingiz Khan and the Mongol empire at its zenith, in Central Asia, 86-123).

Transoxania, together with those steppe lands to the north henceforth to be known as Mogholistān [q.v.] or Mugholistan, came within the ulus or patrimony of Čingiz’s second son Caghatāy, together with Eastern Turkestān (Khārāzim came within the ulus of Djiōč, the eldest son, together with western Siberia and South Russia); but the Caghatāy khanate was not properly constituted till some time after Caghatāy’s own death in ca. 1241. Caghatāy and his descendants took little interest in the sedentary and urban life of Transoxania. Pre-Mongol Turkish landlords and chiefs, the successors of the Iranian dīkhāns, remained influential in the countryside; the descendants of the Karakhanids remained in power in Farghāna, it seems (Barthold, Histoire des Turcs d’Asie Centrale, 118-19). In Mogholistan, to the north of the ili river, there was a distinct decline of urban life in favour of pastoralisation (see ibid., 149-53). Urban traditions in Transoxania were much stronger, and especially notable in the towns there is the prominent role, from Karakhanid times onwards, of local Hanafi religious leaders functioning as headmen (raʾisās, sing. raʾis), usually with the title of șaḍr or șaḍr-i djiōč. Leaders with this title are found in Buḫūrān, Sāmarḵān, Khuḏndān, Uzend, Shāsh and Almūlāh; the best-known of these were the Ādī-Durhān in Buḫūrān (till the revolt of 1580/1948) and their successors, the Ādī-Muhābī (till the mid-18th century) (see O. Pritsak, Ādī-Durhān, in Isl., xxx [1954], 81-96, and șaḍr). Because of this lack of interest in the settled lands on the part of the Caghatāy khanate, the nomadic traditions of the Mongols lasted longer amongst them, as also amongst the Golden Horde in South Russia and the Kipčak steppes (see aušt-i Kipcak in Suppl.), than in the Persia of the Il-Khanids or the northern China of the Great Kūns. The Caghatāy khanate encampments were in Semirečye, in the ili basin, with the town of Almūlāh [q.v.], between the Tien-Shan and Lake Bākšā, as their administrative centre; this town flourished and is favourably described by western travellers to the Great Kūns’ court until it was destroyed in the civil strife amongst the Mongols in the 8th/14th century. Kebek (ca. 1318-26), though still, like the previous kūns, resistant to Islam, moved his capital to Transoxania proper and built a palace near Nāḵshab in the Kāshgā Dārāy valley, although this did not entail renunciation of the nomadic life; from the Mongol term for ‘palace’, kānāt, the nearby town of Nāḵshab came to receive the name which it still bears today, that of Karšī/Karšī (see Karšī). Kebek’s move must nevertheless have favoured the eventual conversion of the Caghatāy kūns to Islam, from the time of Taruḵ̄ūnī onwards (1226-34). Caghatāy rule lasted in Transoxania till the rise of Timūr (see below), and in other parts of Central Asia till after then, but Timūr’s successes were facilitated by increased disunity amongst the Caghatāy family, with Caghatāy puppet rulers placed on the throne by Turkish amirs. For an account of the khanate, see Caghatāy khanate, Caghatāy Khanate; Barthold, Histoire des Turcs d’Asie Centrale, 153 ff., 169-72; Groussot, L’empire des steppes, 397-420; Hamblen, The Caghatāy khanate, in Central Asia, 127 ff.

Timūr, a Barlas Turk from Kīsh in Transoxania, succeeded by force of arms to the Caghatāy khanate there. In 771/1370 he became de facto ruler of Transoxania, ruling in the name of fāmilān descendants of Īq̄eyd, sc. Sayyūrgartmīš (771-90/1370-88) and then his son Māhūd (790-1816/386-1443). He linked himself by marriage to the Caghatāy royal house, including to a daughter of Khīdīr Būdja (d. 801/1399) of Mogholistan, who was reputedly a son of the last significant Caghatāy khan Tūghluq Timūr (760-71/1359-70). Under the rule of Timūr’s descendants, above all, that of Shāhruhk (807-10/1405-47), Transoxania enjoyed much material prosperity, with Sāmarḵān and Buḫūrān becoming lively centres of artistic and literary life, of painting and book-production, and of poetry in both Persian and in Eastern Turkish or Caghatāy, Sāmarḵān was the city which Timūr preferred to all others as his main capital. European travellers like the Spanish envoy Clavijo (1403) describe the splendour of his court, and fine buildings in Sāmarḵān, of which the Gūr Amīr mausoleum and the Bībī Khānīn mosque survive, attest the high aesthetic level of early Timūrid architecture. The reign of Timūr’s grandson Ulugh Beg [q.v.] (ruler in Transoxania from 841/1441, at first as Shāhruhk’s deputy, to 853/1449) is associated with his foundation of a short-lived observatory in Sāmarḵān and the compilation of astronomical tables (see Barthold, Ulugh Beg, tr. V. and T. Minorsky, in Four studies on the history of Central Asia, ii, Leiden 1958, 129-34). As his second capital, Timūr developed Shahr-i Sabz in the Kāshgā Dārāy valley, in the heart of the area of the Barlas Turks and near his own birthplace, starting there the construction of impressive buildings, including his own tomb (see Barthold, Shahr-i
MĀWAṬ? AL-NAHİR — MĀ\n
Suba from Timūr to Ulūgh Beg, tr. J. M. Rogers, in Iran, JHIPS, xvi (1928), 103-26, xvii (1930), 121-43.
Popular Islam, in the form of a cultivation of Sīfī mysticism and the growth of a network of dervish orders, especially blossomed in Transoxiana during Ǧaghatayid and Timūrid times, and the Shaybānids and their orders enjoyed the patronage of the Timūrid rulers. Thus the Naḵshbandi ġayb Kiwaḏ Il-Bayl Allāh Aḏrār (866/1460-90) strengthened the nascent jurīda in Transoxiana, benefiting particularly from the favour of Timūr’s great-grandson Abū Saʿīd and his son Sulṭān Aḥmad; the Naḵshbandiyya were henceforth to play a major role in the history of Islam in Central Asia (see Aḏrār, Kiwaḏ Il-Bayl, in Suppl.). Meanwhile, the Ġaghatayids managed to survive during these years in the lands beyond Transoxiana, and under Eten Etna II (583-97/1189-1203) flourished in Moghbolisṭan and Eastern Turkestān, being hostile however to the later Timūrids. For the detailed history of this period, see Barthold, Histoire des Turcs d’Asie Centrale, 185-84; Grousset, op. cit., 486-546, 568-80; Mahin Hayajianpur, The Timurid Empire, in Central Asia, 150-62; Timūr and Timūrids.

In 906/1500, Muhammad Shaybānī, the son of a line of Mongol khāns, the descendant of Dżoq’s youngest son Shiban (one part of whom had remained in Siberia as khāns and another part of whom had moved southwards into Transoxiana, forming the horde of the Uzbeks [q.v.] or Özbeks), seized power in Transoxiana from the last Timūrid. Transoxania was, indeed, to become the permanent home of the Shaybānids and the Uzbeks, this last Turkish people giving their name to the modern Uzbek SSR, in which they probably form some 70% of the present population. The Shaybānids brought into Transoxiana a Turkish following amongst whom the nomadic steppe traditions remained strong and who were virtually untouched by Iranian cultural and religious influences, as had been most of their predecessors there. It was the strength of popular religion, that of the dervishes and Sīfs, already notable in Timūrid times (see above), rather than that of the orthodox ūlama, which characterised Islam there in the time of the Uzbeks. Like Timūr, they exalted the cult of the Sīfī saint Ahmad Yasawi [q.v.], whose tomb in the lower Syr Dari valley at Yasi had long been a popular pilgrimage place for Turks from all over Inner Asia. The Shaybānids in fact made Yasi their capital for a while, and under them it received its new name of Turkistan, indicative of its importance to the Central Asian Turks in general.

Politically and diplomatically, Sunni Transoxiana under the Uzbeks was in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries frequently involved in warfare with the powerful and aggressive Sīfī monarchy of Ǧaشفīd Persia. As so many earlier Turco-Mongol dynasties had done, the Shaybānids coveted the rich province of Khorāsān, and invaded it on several occasions. But Muhammad Shaybānī (905-14/1500-10) and successors of his like Abu ʿl-Ǧahān ʿUbayd Allāh (940-6/1534-6) failed to overcome the experienced troops of Ǧaشفīl Il and Shāh Taḥmāsp, who had a greater appreciation of the value of the modern weapon of firearms and who had seasoned troops in their Kīlbelīgh Türkmen and then in their Georgian, Armenian, etc., slave guards. The long-term result of this warfare was the virtual sealing-off of Transoxiana from the rest of the Islamic world through the erection by the Ǧaشفīs of this bulwark on their northeastern frontier. Although Turks from Central Asia and Ǧaشفīs streamed into Muslim India as mercenaries, adventurers, etc., the traffic was largely one-way. Hence Transoxiana became culturally introverted and impoverished, since the steppehounds of South Russia and Western Siberia were by the 17th century beginning to come under Russian, Christian control, and the popular Islam of such orders as the Yasawīyya, the Ǧaشفīyya and the Naḵshbandiyya, though intense in religious fervour and emotion, was weak in intellectual content. Only in the sphere of Eastern Turkish or Ġaghatay literature may it be said that Transoxiana made a significant contribution to the cultural stock of Eastern Islam at this time. It was a flexible and expressive enough language for Bāḥr [q.v.] to write his memoirs in it; to produce a lively folk-poetry, see e.g. in the verses of the 18th century Göklen Türkmen bard Naḵshbandi Khulī; and to give rise to a genre of historiography amongst the Shaybānids, the Džanids or Aḏhakbānids and the Mangits of Būḥrān and the Aralbānids of Khiva in the former Khūrazm, although such outstanding figures as the khūrazm 10th/16th century Shaybānīr historian Hāfiz Tashī [q.v. in Suppl.] continued to write for preference in Persian. For the detailed history of the Shaybānids, see Hamby, The Shaybānids, in Central Asia, 163-74; Barthold, Histoire des Turcs d’Asie Centrale, 185 ff.; and Ǧaybānids.

In the course of the 10th/16th century, Būḥrān and Khiva formed themselves into separate, often mutually-hostile khānates, and then in the early 18th century, a third Uzbek khānate arose in the Farghāna valley, that of Khōḵand. The three principalities were to have separate existences, punctuated by much squabbling and internecine warfare, till the Russian occupation of Central Asia in the second half of the 19th century. Būḥrān and Khiva remaining, however, as virtual protectorates of Russia until well after the Bolshevik Revolution.

The history of these khānates can be followed under Būḥrān, Khūrazm, Khiva, Khōḵand; see further Ǧanids, Mungat, Mangits, and also Isāk in Suppl.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C. E. Bosworth)

MĀW (Ar. "water"). The present article covers the religio-magical and the Islamic legal aspects of water, together with irrigation techniques, as follows:

1. Hydromancy
2. Water in classical Islamic law
3. Hydraulic machines
4. Pre-20th century irrigation in Egypt
5. Irrigation in Mesopotamia
6. Irrigation in Persia
7. Irrigation in North Africa and Spain
8. Irrigation in the Ottoman empire
9. Irrigation in pre-20th century Muslim India
10. Irrigation in Transoxiana
11. Economic aspects of modern irrigation
12. Ornamental uses in Muslim India

1. Hydromancy

As a vehicle for the sacred, water has been employed for various techniques of divination, and in particular, for potomanancy (see divination by means of the colour of the waters of a river and their ebbing and flowing; cf. Fr. Cumont, Études syriennes, Paris 1917, 250 ff., notably on the purification power of the Euphrates, consulted for divinatory reasons); for pegomanancy (see omens given by rivers, springs, floods, a feature of Babylonian divination, cf.
THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

C. E. BOSWORTH, E. VAN DONZEL, B. LEWIS AND CH. PELLAT

ASSISTED BY F. TH. DIJKEMA, Mlle M. LEFORT AND Mme S. NURIT

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

SUPPLEMENT

FASCICULES 3–4

BASBĀS—DJAWHAR

LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1981
Anvari and Rashdi-i Watfiz [q.v.], who seem to have ignored him rather disdainfully. Djamal al-Din’s ascetic ideas—including the idea of renunciation—are best presented in the *kasfās* which he wrote in the fashion of Sana’i, though these are far inferior to Sana’i’s ones. His *Dīvān*—comprising *kafridas*, quatrains, and *ghazals*—contains no less than 10,000 verses and displays the lucid and flowing *Irāb* style. Djamal al-Din is said to have died either in 588/1202 or in 600/1203, the former being more likely.


(A. H. Zarrinkoub)

**Djamāl Kārshi,** sobriquet of Abu ‘l-Fadl Djamāl al-Dīn Muhammad b. ‘Umar b. Kāhīl, scholar and administrator in Turkestān during the Mongol era. He was born at Almālīgh around 628/1230-1, his father a bāzīf of Balāsāghūn and his mother originating from Merw. He enjoyed the patronage of the local Turkish dynasty founded at Almālīgh [q.v.] by Būzār (or Rūzār), and obtained a position in the chancellery there. In 662/1264, however, he was obliged to leave Almālīgh, and for the remainder of his life resided at Jāḥārgāh, though travelling widely in western Turkestān. In 681/1282 he composed a Persian commentary (*ṣūrah*) on the great lexicon *al-Sīhāb* of Dīwāhari [q.v.], subsequently adding to it a historical and biographical supplement. Djamāl Kārshi’s *Muḥākāt al-Sūrah* is in fact the only historical source we possess emanating from the Central Asian state founded by Kaydu [q.v.]. Extracts of the work, which includes particularly valuable sections on the Karakhanids [see *Ilekhān*], and the Mongol rulers of Turkestān [see *Zaghatay Khānate*], surveys of various Central Asian cities, and biographies of local divines, were edited by Barthold in *Turkestān*, Russ. ed., i, 128-52. The *Muḥākāt* was completed soon after the accession of Kaydu’s son Capar [q.v.] in 702/1303, the latest date mentioned. The date of Djamāl Kārshi’s death is unknown. The surname is due to his connection with the rulers of Almālīgh (*kārshi* = “palace”), and is not a *nīqa* from Kūrāygh as was formerly supposed.

**Bibliography:** V. V. Barthold, in *Zapiski Vostočnoj Otdelennoj Imperatorskogo Rossijskogo Arkeologicheskogo Obščestva*, xi (1897-8), 283-7; idem, *Turkestān*, ii, 51-2; Brockelmann, I, 286, S I, 528; H. F. Hofman, *Turkish literature*, iii/i, 3, Utrecht 1969, 84-9, with full MS references.

(P. Jackson)

**Al-Djamīya al-ʿArabīyya,** the Arab League. Established at the end of the Second World War, this reflects the desire to renew the original unity, a desire which has continued to be active in Muslim communities following the decline and subsequent collapse of the Arab-Islamic empire. It was during the final years of the 19th century and before the First World War that Arab nationalists became aware of their national homogeneity, based on a common language and destiny, and on a similar way of life and culture (*kawmīyya* [q.v.]). Egypt, reverting to the cause of Arabism between the two World Wars, in order to put an obstacle in the way of Ḥāshimite designs (a plan for a Greater Syria conceived at ʿAmmān, or for a Fertile Crescent, put forward by Bagdād) took the initiative of assembling in Alexandria representatives of the Arab States regarded as being independent. This meeting, marked by the signing of a protocol (7 October 1944), laid the foundations of a unity which was ratified the following year in Cairo, where on 22 March 1945 the Pact of the Arab League was signed by Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan and Yemen. Subsequently, the League has been joined by the following countries: Libya (1951), Sudan (1956), Tunisia and Morocco (1958), Kuwait (1961), Algeria (1962), South Yemen (1967), the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Bahrayn and ʿUmān (1971), Mauritania and Somalia (1974) and Djibouti (1977). Furthermore, the Palestine Liberation Organisation has been admitted, first in the capacity of an observer (1966), then as a full member (1976).

The text adopted by the founders after long discussion, is remarkable for its flexibility and its simplicity. It specifies that the object of the League is "the forging of links between the member States and the coordination of their policies" with the aim of fostering collaboration in respect of each one of them.

**The components of the Organisation** are currently the following:

- The Council of the League, the supreme body, which can meet at the level of Heads of State, Prime Ministers or Foreign Ministers. Summit meetings composed of Heads of State since 1964 have been:

- The Council decides questions of administration by a simple majority, but in all important cases, decisions are only binding if they have been taken unanimously. Conversely, they are binding only on the States that have voted for them (art. 7).

- Five other councils, at ministerial level (common defence, economics, information, health, youth) were instituted in 1956.

- Ten permanent committees are charged with studying various questions entrusted to them and submitting in various cases projects for resolution or recommendations.

- An administrative tribunal and a committee of financial control are directly responsible to the Council of the League.

- Seventeen specialised agencies have been instituted by particular agreements to investigate common technical problems.

- The permanent Secretariat-General, which is directed by a Secretary-General elected by a two-thirds majority, himself assisted by a number of additional secretaries, comprises several departments and controls specialised bureaux, institutes and social centres. Three Egyptians have successively held the office of Secretary General of the Arab League:

  3. Maḥmūd Riḍā (since 1 June 1972).

The Secretariat-General maintains permanent delegations to the United Nations in New York and