

Studia Culturae Islamicae No.119

MEIS Series No. 29

近代中央ユーラシアにおける 歴史叙述と過去の参照

Historical Narratives and the Utilization of the Past
in Modern Central Asia

野田 仁 (編)

東京外国語大学アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究所

Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa

Historical Narratives and the Utilization of the Past in Modern Central Asia

Preface	Jin NODA	1
Chapter 1		
What Did the Later Jochid Sources Refer to and How Did They Recognize the Reorganization of the Jochid Ulus?	Hiroyuki NAGAMINE	5
Chapter 2		
Between Hagiography and World History: Muhammad Amin Kashghari's <i>Asar al-Futuḥ</i>	David BROPHY	53
Chapter 3		
Mulla Musa Sayrami's Pursuit of History: Considering the Introduction of Ta'rīkh-i ḥamīdī	Takahiro ONUMA	71
Chapter 4		
Khivan Chronicles in the Nineteenth Century	Akifumi SHIOYA	93
Chapter 5		
Modern Iranians' Views on their Turkic past	Nobuaki KONDO	107
Chapter 6		
Historicizing Turkistan: Russian Rule and Mullā 'Ālim's <i>Ta'rīḥ-i Tūrkistān</i>	Satoru KIMURA	121
Chapter 7		
National Hero Emerging in the Twilight of Nomadic Hero: On the Positioning of a Collaborator of the Russian Rule in the Process of Nation Building.	Tetsu AKIYAMA	159
Chapter 8		
Historical Writings of the Modern Kazakhs: View of the Intelligentsia from Altay, Aqit Ulimjiuli	Jin NODA	179
Chapter 9		
Zeki Velidi Togan's Utilization of the Past and View of Turkic History: Focus on Turkish National Coat of Arms (1925–1927)	Ryosuke ONO	197
Chapter 10		
Ego Documents and Muslim Intellectuals in the Early Soviet Period: An Autobiographical Memoir by Ḥasan-'Āṭā' Gabashī in 1928	Masumi ISOGAI	225

はじめに

本書は、東京外国語大学アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究所（AA研）における共同研究共同利用課題「近代中央ユーラシアにおける歴史叙述と過去の参照」（2019～2021年度）の成果である。

本研究の構想は、筆者の専門に照らして、カザフ人の歴史を考えたとき、たとえば16世紀のカザフの君主たちの事績が多く年代記に記されているのに対して、それらの情報は後代のカザフの歴史叙述には直接引き継がれていなかった。つまり、後の時代のロシア東洋学における「発見」（たとえばヴェリヤミノフ・ゼルノフやワリハノフ¹）を待たねばならなかったのだが、このような不参照をどのように考えるべきなのかという点からスタートしている。

そこから、どのような過去を参照・取捨選択するのか、どのように自分たちの過去を切り取るのかという歴史認識の問題が生じてくる。付随的に、この地域の歴史研究に欠かせないロシア東洋学の二重の規定も相対化することも想定していた。これは、同時代の東洋学の枠組みに、史料を扱う研究者たちの視線を加えた、いわば二重の制約を意味している。例としては第9章が扱うトガンの研究を参照されたい。ただし、全体としてまだ十分に検討するに至っていないことは断っておきたい。

したがって、本研究で実際に進めたことは、史料の継承関係や参照・影響などの考察に限られている。とくに参照という意味で、どこまで史料が広がっていたのかを考えることを念頭においている。これは中央ユーラシアの範囲をとらえ直す作業とも言える。また、近代における歴史叙述を考えるうえで、前提となる近代以前の史料状況・ヒストリオグラフィーに注目する第1章は不可欠である。

近代になると、当然ながら民族集団ごとの叙述が目立ち、それに即した検討とならざるを得ないが、2つの点に留意したい。第一に、上に示したようなロシア植民地の知の枠組みを意識すること²、第二に、ロシアの枠組みから外れる地域との比較であり、中国にかかわる第3章、第8章、またイランを扱う第5章が相当するだろう。本研究で十分に検討できたわけではないが、民族概念（「公式」な民族とそうでない民族）と歴史認識の相関も課題の一つであった。ともすると細分化されがちな中央ユーラシア史であるが、地域間のつながり、歴史叙述の共有は重要であり、共同研究の意義もそこにあると言えるだろう。

このような問題意識の下、本共同研究課題は、19世紀後半から20世紀初頭を中心の時期に据え、中央ユーラシアのさまざまな民族集団が叙述する歴史書・歴史文献の内容と、そこに見える歴史認

1 次の文献がアブルガーズィーの史書やカーディルガリー『集史』（第1章を参照されたい）を引用している。
В.В. Вельяминов-Зернов 1864. Исследование о Касимовских царях и царевичах. Санктпетербург; Ч.Ч. Валиханов 1985. Собрание сочинений в пяти томах, т. 2, Алма-Ата.

2 メタナラティヴとしての植民地的知に注意する必要がある（小泉順子編『歴史の生成——叙述と沈黙のヒストリオグラフィ』京都大学学術出版会, 2018）。

ンゴル』中近東文化センター：35-47.

—— 1991.「遊牧ウズベク史研究（1）」『COSMICA』20: 165-177.

—— 2000.「モンゴル帝国とティムール帝国」小松久男（編）『中央ユーラシア史』（新版世界各国史4）山川出版社：174-244.

—— 2005.「アブル・ガーズィー」小松久男他（編）『中央ユーラシアを知る事典』平凡社：30.

間野英二 2001.『バーブルとその時代』（バーブル・ナーマの研究4 研究篇）松香堂.

宮脇淳子 1996.「ロシアにおけるチンギス統原理」『ロシア史研究』58: 16-24.

村上正二 1993.『モンゴル帝国史研究』風間書房.

森川哲雄 2007.『モンゴル年代記』白帝社.

矢島洋一 2017.「ナジュムッディーン・クブラーの殉教」『13-14世紀モンゴル史研究』2: 13-20.

Text

Between Hagiography and World History: Muhammad Amin Kashghari's *Asar al-Futuḥ*

DAVID Brophy

Abstract

This article examines an incomplete work of world history, the *Asar al-Futuḥ* (*Signs of Divine Gifts*), written ca. 1800 by Muhammad Amin Kashghari. Kashghari's work tells the story of the prominent Sufi lineage of Eastern Turkistan known as the White Mountain khojas, two members of which ruled briefly in the Tarim Basin in the 1750s before being driven into exile by a Qing invasion and executed in Badakhshan. Rather than adopt the conventions of Central Asian hagiography, Kashghari sought to situate this narrative within the scope of a traditional Islamic world history, with its emphasis on the rise and fall of dynasties. While the work was never finished, it nevertheless offers valuable insights into how this Kashgari exile community interpreted their predicament in the late eighteenth century, and also into the ideological marrying of notions of sainthood and dynastic rule in the wake of the collapse of the Chinggisid principle in Central Asia.

本稿は、1800年前後にムハマド・アミン・カーシュガリーによって書かれた世界史の未完の著作『Asar al-Futuḥ（神の賜物の徴）』を考察する。カーシュガリーの著作は、東トルキスタンで著名なスーフィーの系統である白山党ホージャの物語であり、そのうちの2人が1750年代にタリム盆地を短期間支配したが、清の侵攻によって追放され、その後処刑されたことを描いている。カーシュガリーは、この物語を、中央アジアの聖者伝の手法を採るのではなく、王朝の興亡に重きを置く伝統的なイスラーム世界史の範囲に位置づけようとした。この作品は完成には至らなかったが、18世紀後半にカシュガルに亡命者たちがどのように自分たちの苦境を解釈したのか、また中央アジアのチンギス統原理が崩壊した後、聖人の概念と王朝の統治がどのようなイデオロギーのもとで結びついたのかを知る上で貴重な資料となっている。

Table of Contents:

1. Introduction
2. The White Mountain Exile Community
3. The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* as a Work of World History
4. The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* on the Struggle for Uyghuristan
5. Conclusion

Keywords

Sufism, Naqshbandiyya, historiography, Qing Empire, Xinjiang, Kokand

1. Introduction

The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* (*Signs of Divine Gifts*) is an incomplete Persian-language history written at the turn of the nineteenth century by Zayn al-Din Muḥammad Amin (Ṣadr) Kashghari. In the introduction, Kashghari says that he set about composing the work in the year 1205/1790–91, and towards the end of the manuscript he describes himself as still writing in the year 1220/1805–6.¹ The author tells us precious little about his own life, but throughout this time he was most probably living in or around Samarqand. The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* is a second, revised draft of a work that first bore the title of *Durar al-Akhbar* (*Pearls of Accounts*). In two places in the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* the title of the work is actually given as *Durar-i Akhbar*, which is then crossed out and replaced with the new title, *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*.² Thankfully we also have a manuscript of the earlier *Durar al-Akhbar*, allowing for comparison between the two versions of the work, and some analysis of the author's editorial techniques. Both texts survive in single manuscript copies only. Originally kept in Bukhara, today they belong to the collection of the Abu Reyhon Biruni Institute of Oriental Studies in Tashkent.³ Both are written in the same flat *nasta'liq* hand with inconsistent, often non-existent pointing, and are therefore likely to be Kashghari's own autographs.

The author, Muḥammad Amin Kashghari, was part of the community of disciples surrounding his namesake Khoja Muḥammad Amin, a man better known as Khoja Sarimsaq (or Samsaq). Sarimsaq, son of Khoja

Burhan al-Din, was the sole member of the “White Mountain” khoja lineage of East Turkistani holy men, members of the Naqshbandi Sufi order, to survive the Qing invasion of the Tarim Basin of 1759. Having fled from the advancing Qing army into Badakhshan, Sarimsaq and his companions then embarked on a long exile in Transoxiana, eventually coming to settle on the fringes of the Kokand Khanate. Muḥammad Amin Kashghari's work is the only historical text known to have been written within this circle of exiles, and is one of very few works to narrate the history of the Qing conquest of what is today the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region from a local Muslim point of view. Like the more widely circulating *Tazkira-i 'Azizan*, the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* sheds light on the internecine struggles among beg and khoja elites amid the collapse of Junghar Mongol rule in the mid-eighteenth century.⁴ Unlike the *Tazkira-i 'Azizan*, however, it presents this history from the perspective of the ultimate losers of this contest: the White Mountain khoja brothers Khoja Burhan al-Din and Khoja Jahan. If the *Tazkira-i 'Azizan* can be considered the mainstream narrative, preferred by the Qing-era beg elite, the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* offers us a dissenting perspective on this history.

Still a relatively unknown work, scholarly interest in the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* has been mainly confined to Uyghur Orientalists. Among the first to work on the text was Mahmud Qutluqov, who in 1989 published a translation of parts of its account of the history of Uyghuristan (the term that Kashghari adopts for the entire Tarim Basin), and in 2000 provided a substantial description of the work.⁵ Alongside Qutluqov, Ablet Khodzhaev made use of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* for his *Tsinskaia imperia i vostochnii Turkestan v XVIII v.* (1991), still one of the best accounts of the Qing encroachment on, and eventual annexation of, the Tarim Basin.⁶ Khodzhaev rightly calls attention to the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* as a source for relations between the Muslim nobility and Junghar khans, as well as its description of the encounter between the Qing invasion force and Burhan al-Din. Because of its unique account of these events, the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* has generally been regarded as a source for the history of Xinjiang (or Eastern Turkistan). Yet this particular section of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* only forms one part of the work, the second “discourse” (*maqāla*) of the second “book” (*daftar*). A proper reading of this section should consider the author's efforts to place this narrative within a wider arc of world history.

2. The White Mountain Exile Community

To summarise a story told at length elsewhere, the Muslims of the Tarim Basin, who had experienced decades of Junghar Mongol domination, inevitably found themselves caught up in the Junghar civil war of the 1750s and the ensuing Qing invasion. The beg elite of the Tarim Basin had been active participants in the political life of the Junghar state, bringing their Islamic society into close contact with the steppe to the north. At first

1 *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* (AF below): fol. 196b.

2 AF: fols 113b, 114a.

3 For catalogue descriptions, see Semenov et al. 1952: 78–79 (*Durar al-Akhbar*); Iusupova and Dzhaliilova 1998: 319–320 (both works). Bartol'd mentions consulting the *Durar al-Akhbar* on a trip to Bukhara in 1920, noting also that V. L. Viatkin had come across a different, “complete copy” of the work in the same city, which I take to be a reference to the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*. Bartol'd 1973: 376.

4 Kashghari 2021.

5 Kutlukov 1989, 2000.

6 Khodzhaev 1991. The author discusses the value of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* on p. 44.

the Qing refrained from sending troops south into the Tarim Basin, hoping to rely on two deputies, Khoja Burhan al-Din and Khoja Jahan, a pair of brothers descended from Hidayatullah Khoja Afaq (d. 1694), and who had spent their lives captive to the Junghars in the Ili region. However, this hands-off policy failed. First, the Junghar aristocrat Amursana rebelled in the north of Xinjiang, and then in 1757 Burhan al-Din and Khoja Jahan likewise turned on the Qing, killing the court's representative in the town of Uch. The collapse of Qing control over these regions led to the re-conquest of Jungharia and the invasion of southern Xinjiang by a Manchu and Mongolian army. The khoja brothers were left with little choice but to flee, opting for Badakhshan. There, the local monarch Sulṭān Shah captured and killed them to placate the Qing, with their remains eventually disinterred and sent back to China. The size of the exodus that accompanied the khojas into Badakhshan is hard to determine, but one local source puts it at three thousand families.⁷ Among the refugees was Muḥammad Amin, author of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, who can only have been an infant at the time of this flight. According to his introduction, he commenced work on the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* when he was thirty-nine years old, placing his birth in 1166/1752–3.

Qing sources give us some limited information with which to reconstruct the fate of these refugees. According to palace memorials, Sarimsaq first sought refuge in Rustaq, a region neighboring Badakhshan, whose chief entrusted him to his brother Midzarab (Mirza 'Arab?), the beg of "Imam 'Ali," or Mazar-i Sharif.⁸ One account claims that soon after this, officials of Aḥmad Shah Durrani came and brought the boy to Kabul, and that Sarimsaq accompanied Aḥmad Shah on one of his invasions of India in the 1760s.⁹ From there he made his way back to Qunduz, where he received protection from Qubad Khan.¹⁰ In 1770, Qubad Khan took revenge on Sulṭān Shah of Badakhshan, imprisoning and eventually executing him in Qunduz. According to one letter that reached the Qing from Sulṭān Shah's son Muḥammad Shah, Sarimsaq participated in this campaign and killed Sulṭān Shah himself.¹¹ When Qubad died at the hands of an Uzbek-appointed governor by the name of Khuda Naṣar, Sarimsaq is said to have again taken up residence in Mazar-i Sharif (Shah-i Mardan) with a handful of devotees.¹² He was still there in 1780, when a spy informed Qing officials that he was living as an indigent *qalandar*.¹³

The preface of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* picks up the story at this point, informing us that in 1781 Sarimsaq and

his following moved on from Qunduz, travelling via Kerki on the Amu Darya, Qarshi, a place called Ma'sumabad (?), and finally to Bukhara. There Sarimsaq made a pilgrimage to the city's various shrines, including that of Baha' al-Din Naqshband. At this point there is a significant divergence in the accounts of the *Durar al-Akhbar* and the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*. The earlier *Durar al-Akhbar* claims that Sarimsaq received an official appointment from the incoming Manghit khan of Bukhara, Shah Murad (r. 1785–1800). At his behest, we are told, Sarimsaq "engaged in the government of the paradisiacal land of Samarqand."¹⁴ The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, by contrast, says nothing about any such appointment. In fact, as I will discuss below, it exhibits a decidedly anti-Manghit tone. Here the same section of the introduction says only that the khoja paid a visit to the shrines of Samarqand, including those of Qussam ibn 'Abbas (the Shah-i Zinda complex) and the Naqshbandi shaykh Khoja 'Ubaydullah Aḥrar. Such was his piety, Kashghari explains, that Sarimsaq "had with firm resolve voluntarily shunned the ranks of majesty and fame, and consigned himself to the path of poverty and renunciation."¹⁵ In other words, he was still a wandering mendicant.

Following this pilgrimage to Samarqand, Sarimsaq took up residence in the neighboring village of Dahbid, an important centre of the family of Makhdum-i A'zam from which Sarimsaq descended. There he entered the service of someone described as a cousin of Sarimsaq and holding the position of *shaykh al-Islam*. In all likelihood this is a reference to Khoja Muḥammad Amin Dahbidi (also known as Ishan Pir, d. 1226/1811), the leading member of the influential Dahbidi branch of Makhdumzadas, who were now affiliated with the Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya.¹⁶ Nearing the conclusion of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, Kashghari provides some discussion of this Dahbidi khoja family, in which he calls Khoja Muḥammad Amin "our pir" (*pīr-i mā*), indicating that he himself may have taken the Dahbidi shaykh as his spiritual guide.¹⁷ We have an indication here of how this exile Kashgari community was obliged to adapt to existing hierarchies among the khoja families of Transoxiana.¹⁸

Interestingly enough, the contrasting pictures of Sarimsaq's status in the two versions of Kashghari's work correspond to a similar bifurcation in Qing sources. These confirm that as early as 1784, Sarimsaq was already living in Samarqand. In letters that he had delivered to White Mountain loyalists in Kashgar, he claimed that he had a large following of two thousand families, and that Shah Murad Bi had assigned the city of Samarqand to him (*Ṣamarqandni bizgā taslīm qildi*).¹⁹ Yet upon investigation, Qing informants provided a

7 Boldyrev 1997: 46.

8 Zhongguo diyi lishi dang'anguan, and Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu zhongxin 2012 (QXMD below): vol. 149, pp. 438–446 (testimony of Muḥammad Amin).

9 QXMD: vol. 96, pp. 121–124 (testimony of Nur Muḥammad).

10 On Qubad Khan, see McChesney 1991: 227–230.

11 First Historical Archives (Beijing), Manwen lufu zouzhe 2414-002 092-0339/03340. The fact that Sarimsaq was in Qubad's train during the attack on Sulṭān Shah explains why some sources report that Sarimsaq himself ruled Badakhshan after Sulṭān Shah, e.g. Gankovskii 1958: 31.

12 QXMD: vol. 131, pp. 300–303.

13 QXMD: vol. 141, pp. 302–305.

14 Kashghari n.d.: fol. 4b. The text reads *ba-ṣavābdīd-i ... Amīr Ġāzī Bī Ma'sūm ... ba-ḥukūmat-i balda-i firdaus-mānand-i Ṣamarqand iṣṭiḡāl namūda...* (superfluous qualifiers omitted).

15 AF: fol. 7a.

16 On this figure see Babadžanov 1996: 396–397.

17 AF: fol. 196b.

18 Note that the catalogue descriptions of Kashghari's work seem to confuse Sarimsaq with this Muḥammad Amin Dahbidi.

19 First Historical Archives (Beijing), Manwen lufu zouzhe 03-0190-3010-014. A translation of one of these letters can be found in QXMD: vol. 162, pp. 69–70. Here the Manchu text reads *Ṣamuratbi ... Semergan i babe minde buhe*, i.e. "Shah Murad Bi gave Samarqand to me."

very different picture of the exile community: that Sarimsaq was living in poverty with only a handful of followers.²⁰ While for now it is impossible to say whether or not Sarimsaq ever did actually enjoy the favor of the Manghit dynasty, we can conclude that it was part of his self-presentation for a time. He may have briefly been party to some scheme to consolidate Manghit control of the Samarqand region, or else extend Bukharan influence towards Kokand. Alternatively, the Kashgari exiles may have simply made the story up to burnish his credentials in the eyes of potential allies in Kashgar.

Sources indicate that Sarimsaq's stay in Samarqand did not last long. Having resumed contact with the Tarim Basin, he was able to rally the support of certain disaffected Kirghiz officials, including Yalchi, the son of the Qipchaq governor of Tashmaliq Akim, who joined Sarimsaq's following in Ura Tepe (Istaravshan).²¹ Now with something of a fighting force behind him, Sarimsaq requested the support of Khudayar, the semi-independent beg of Khojand, for a raid on Qing territory. Such support was not forthcoming, however, and the mobilisation ended up bringing Sarimsaq into conflict with the Kokand khan. Kashghari mentions Sarimsaq's "holy wars" (*ghazavāt u yūriš*) against Ferghana as a topic he intended to cover in the final discourse of his work, hinting at the serious nature of the rift between Sarimsaq and the Kokand khan Narbota Bi (d. 1799). Rumors of a possible incursion by Sarimsaq continued to trouble Qing officials into the late 1790s, following which point the evidentiary trail runs cold.²² While Sarimsaq may have eventually lived out his life in Bukhara, his sons and grandsons made a base for themselves in the Ferghana Valley, from where they came to mount a challenge to Qing rule in the Tarim Basin.

3. The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* as a Work of World History

Kashghari's work was intended primarily as a tribute to the saintly Kashgari family he had dedicated himself to. As he describes in the introduction, he was inspired to set pen to page at the instructions of "the Reverend Makhdumzada" (*Ḥaẓrat-i Makhdumzāda*, i.e. Sarimsaq), and in honor of "the greatest sultan, patron of the peoples, standard-bearer of justice and virtue, defender against tyranny and injustice," Khoja Burhan al-Din.²³ But this hagiographic narrative was to be set against a much more sweeping backdrop of world history. The author's aim was "to compose an album decorated with the events of the known world and the happenings of the mortal realm, comprising the affairs of the kings and caliphs, the sultans and amirs, the pious men and great shaykhs, governors and wise men of high position; a description of the deeds of the leaders of mankind,

the exploits of the greats of the day, and an account of the illustrious forefathers of His Sultanic Grace (i.e. Khoja Burhan al-Din)... and the incidents from his birth to the founding of his felicitous state and his accession to the throne... and the events which took place in those days, until the time of his martyrdom, and some of the circumstances of the Reverend Makhdumzada (i.e. Sarimsaq), concluding with strange and wonderful stories which have been relayed in trustworthy texts."²⁴

Although usually classified as a history of Eastern Turkistan, the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* is therefore better thought of as a universal history in the classical mould. Like many such works that have come down to us (e.g. Maḥmud ibn Vali's *Baḥr al-Asrar*), the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* is incomplete, but we can see its intended scope from the outline that Kashghari provides in the introduction. Here he informs us that he intended for his story to consist of sixteen discourses (*maqāla*), organized into two books (*daftar*) as follows:

Book One	Book Two
Introduction	Introduction
1. The creation of the heavens and earth, an explication of the Jann and the Jinn, and an enumeration of the saints and apostles.	1. On the descent of Khoja Burhan al-Din from 'Ali son of Abu Talib, the achievements of his illustrious ancestors, and an account of his sons.
2. On the sultans of Arabia and Persia and the ancient kings.	2. On Khoja Afaq and his reign in Uyghuristan, the reign of his unfortunate sons, and the Chaghatayid Khaqans and Oirat Sultans who were contemporary with him.
3. On the Prophet Muḥammad, his holy wars and miracles.	3. On the dominion of the Oirat Sultans in Uyghuristan, and the chiefs and amirs who were contemporary with them.
4. On the four caliphs, the twelve imams, and the sages of mankind.	4. On the saintliness of Khoja Burhan al-Din and Khoja Jahan, the death of their father [Khoja Aḥmad], the rebellion of the evil Khitay infidels against the Mongols, Khoja Burhan al-Din's rise to rulership, and Khoja Jahan's wars.
5. On the Abbasid and Isma'ili caliphs, and the kings who were contemporary with them.	5. Khoja Burhan al-Din's wresting of Uyghuristan from its Ishāqi rulers and his accession to the sultan-ic throne, with an account of events from the middle of 1169/1755–56 until the middle of 1173/1759–60, describing the peace of the commoners and the well-being of the scholars.
6. On the rise of Chinggis Khan and his conquests, and the Sultans of Rum and the rulers of Egypt who were his contemporaries.	6. The martyrdom of Aḥmad Shah Durrani, and Shah Sultān of Badakshan's dispatch of Sarimsaq's three brothers to China along with their mothers and some amirs.

24 AF: fols 6a, 9a.

20 These Qing sources are summarised in Saguchi 1968.

21 AF: fol. 120a; QXMD: vol. 169, pp. 51–54.

22 See Onuma 2014: 254–55.

23 In the introduction to the *Durar al-Akhbar* (fol. 4b), Kashghari names his patron as Sharaf al-Din Abu Ibrahim Sayyid Muḥammad Amin, but in the same location in the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* he declines to name him out of modesty, simply referring to him as *Ḥaẓrat-i Makhdumzāda*.

Book One	Book Two
7. On Amir Temür, his conquest of the world, with discussion of his heirs, and the sultans and wise men who were contemporary with him.	7. On the sultans and rulers who were contemporary with Khoja Burhan al-Din.
8. On the Savafid Sultans and their dominion in Iraq, Azarbaijan, and Iran.	8. A summary of Sarimsaq's circumstances, describing his campaign against Ferghana, the arrival of an emissary from the Emperor of China, the death of the three great amirs (Khudayar Bi of the Yüz, Narbota Bi of the Ming, and Shah Murad of the Manghit), and the rise of Amir Haydar.

We can assume that much of the first book would have derived from existing sources, of which Kashghari provides a long list in the introduction. In this bibliographic excursus he mentions works ranging from chronicles of the Ilkhanid period down to more contemporary Safavid and Uzbek histories, the last work in the list being Muḥammad Qaṣi Vafa Karminagi's mid-eighteenth-century *Tarikh-i Muḥammad Raḥimnāma* (better known as the *Tarikh-i Raḥimī*).²⁵ Much of the second book, though, would have derived from the historical memory of author's own Kashgari exile community, and filled some considerable gaps in our view of this relatively unknown period of Central Asian history. Unfortunately, in the form in which they have survived, the *Durar al-Akhbar* and *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* provide only a part of the intended work. *Durar al-Akhbar*, 132 folios in length, confines itself to Book One only, beginning with the creation narrative and ending midway through a description of the Prophet Muḥammad's pilgrimage to Mecca. The more substantial *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* (199 folios) is made up of the following divisions:

Introduction		2b–9b
Book One	Part One (<i>juzv-i nukhustīn</i>), consisting mainly of a section (<i>guftār</i>) on the purpose of the existence of noble sultans.	12b–68a
Book Two	First Discourse (<i>maqāla</i>), on Makhdum-i A'zam, divided into seven chapters (<i>bāb</i>), but ending midway through the fifth, in a narration of the descendants of Makhdum-i A'zam.	68b–111a
	Second Discourse (<i>maqāla</i>), made up of twenty-six sections (<i>guftār</i>), on the history of Eastern Turkistan.	113b–153b
	On the Uzbeks of Bukhara, including sections on 'Abdullah Khan, Pir Muḥammad Khan b. Jani Beg Sulṭān, the death of Shah Murad, the events surrounding 'Umar Bi Basr.	154b–198b

²⁵ Karminagi 2015.

As can readily be seen, the structure of the existing work falls well short of Kashghari's ambitious original outline, suggesting that the author was still experimenting with the form of his work. While given the title of Discourse 2 in the text, the section on Uyghuristan covers topics which are described in the Introduction as belonging to Discourses 3, 4, and 5 of Book Two, before coming to an abrupt end on fol. 153b in the middle of a description of Khoja Burhan al-Din's siege of Yarkand in late 1755. The section following this corresponds more or less to the intended Discourse 7 of Book Two, but is not titled as such. At various points in the text, the author refers back to Book One, where he says that he has touched on themes such as the Uzbek overthrow of the Temürids (f. 116b), the rise of the Oirat Mongols and the reign of Dabachi Khan (f. 118a, 121a, 124a), and the death of the Chaghatayid 'Abd al-Laṭif Khan, son of Yolbars Khan (f. 145b). Unfortunately, these sections do not occur in the manuscript that we have to hand.

As is evident from his outline, Kashghari's narrative of Uyghuristan's history was intended to sit alongside a more expansive world history. His model in doing so was the prestigious tradition of Persian world history, beginning with Adam and the line of Islamic prophets. In adopting this dynastic model, Kashghari's work can be considered as a culmination of an ideological trend witnessed elsewhere in the Tarim Basin Naqshbandi tradition: the assimilation of hagiographic narratives into local royal traditions surrounding the Qarakhanid and Chaghatayid dynasties. This was achieved in part through actual intermarriage with these prestigious lineages, and in part through revising and shifting the emphasis of earlier elements in this tradition. The heightened significance, for example, of a story crediting Makhdum-i A'zam with a Qarakhanid genealogy is one noticeable feature of this Eastern Turkistani tradition, a trope evident in both the *Tazkira-i 'Azizan* and the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*.²⁶ In this respect Khoja Afaq's eldest son Khoja Yahya, grandfather of the khoja brothers featured in the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, also plays an important role. It was Yahya who first took the title "khan khoja" while ruling Kashgar in the 1690s, and did much to establish a precedent for the royal pretensions of the White Mountain tradition. His grandson Burhan al-Din was likewise widely known as "khan khoja," though Kashghari prefers the title of "His Sultanic Grace" (*Haẓrat-i Salṭanat-shi'ārī*, literally "clad in sultanhood") for his hero and adopts the title *Janāb-i Sulṭānī* for Khoja Jahan.

Given the context in which Kashghari was writing, it seems appropriate to link his style of presentation with the wider erosion of the Chinggisid principle in eighteenth century Transoxiana, allowing for the construction of new, hybrid, discourses of legitimacy. From this perspective we might compare his portrayal of Khoja Burhan al-Din as the heir to the Chaghatayid legacy with the rise of the "tribal" Uzbek dynasties of the Qonghirat (Khorazm), Manghit (Bukhara) and Ming (Kokand). In fact, there are hints throughout the work that Kashghari considered his protagonists as *more* deserving of rulership than their Uzbek contemporaries. As already mentioned, his attitude towards the Uzbeks is highly denigrating: "injustice and oppression are among the features of the province of the Uzbek, for disruption and sedition is fixed in their constitution, and

²⁶ See the discussion in DeWeese 2013.

their nature is pre-disposed to this.” He depicts the Uzbeks as a disruptive, leaderless horde, indulging in folk etymology to prove that they are each master unto themselves: “the obedience of this people to their khans and sultans is not what it is among the Chaghatay: each one of them is an *amir* of his own, and the word ‘Uzbek’ conveys this meaning” (i.e. *öz* “self” + *beg*).²⁷ His deprecatory tone makes it unlikely that Kashghari intended his text for wide circulation among the Uzbek elite of Transoxiana.

The ornate, even bombastic language the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, peppered with Quranic quotations, is of course one of the consequences of adopting this genre of Islamic world history. While some sections of Kashghari’s work move relatively quickly, at points he dwells at inordinate length on descriptions of cities such as Yarkand, or events such as festive gatherings. Another way in which Kashghari’s work calls to mind earlier world histories, particularly of the Mongol empire period, is his effort to display a degree of knowledge of the Mongolian language. At certain points, Kashghari tries to represent the original language of his Mongolian actors, e.g. the Junghar Dabachi Khan’s son Lobcha Noyan, when taken prisoner by the *beg* of Aqsu: “He attacked them, and cried “tebke!”²⁸ In the Mongolian language (*lafz-i Mughūlī*) the word “tebke” means “unhand him!” (f. 123b). In another example, while discussing the Junghar Lama Dorji’s title “Erdeni Lama Batur Khuntayji,” he tries to define *erdeni lama*: “In the terminology of the Oirat language and the language of that tribe, *lama* is what they call teacher (*mullā*) and student (*tālib al-‘ilm*), and *erdeni* means king. Putting it together, *erdeni lama* means ‘Wise King’” (fol. 118a). This is not entirely accurate: the Mongolian word *erdeni* means “jewel” and not “king.” But we nevertheless gain a sense here that the author was seeking to give a more cosmopolitan flavor to his work by including such linguistic digressions.

Another interesting feature of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, which may or may not be connected to the question of genre, is its use of archaic or alternative toponyms, such as Ardabil for Aqsu, Safidkuh for Uch, and Urum for Turfan. The use of Uyghuristan to refer to the entire region of today’s Xinjiang, not simply historical Uyghuristan (i.e. eastern Xinjiang), also stands out as unorthodox for the author’s time.²⁹ The existence of some of these toponyms can be confirmed on the basis of earlier sources. In the case of Aqsu, for example, the name Ardabil is attested in conversion narratives surrounding the Chaghatayid Tughluq Temür Khan.³⁰ In the case of Urum, by contrast, we seem to have a reflection of the association of Turfan with the shrine of the Seven Sleepers, and by extension with “Rum” (Anatolia), the site of the original Seven Sleepers shrine.³¹ In the case

of Safidkuh it is unclear whether this was an alternative toponym that was recognised by the inhabitants of the Tarim Basin, but the name, meaning “white mountain,” may provide a hint as to the origins of the designation “White Mountain” (*Aqtaghliq*) for the Sufi faction allied with Khoja Burhan al-Din.³²

4. The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* on the Struggle for Uyghuristan

We can assume, I think, that many of Kashghari’s editorial choices were dictated by his objective, in a highly competitive political environment, to demonstrate the ongoing legitimacy of the White Mountain khoja lineage to rule the Tarim Basin. The theme of who has the right to rule, and why, occupies a large section of Book One of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, which collects stories of various kings and emperors in explication of the “purpose of the existence of mighty sultans.” The second discourse of Book Two, the section on Uyghuristan, opens by continuing this discussion of the nature of imperial authority. The approach to history underlying the author’s analysis relies on the concept of the *ṣāhib-qirān*: in a cyclical fashion, the affairs of the world gradually tend towards instability and disruption, which necessitates the divine ordination of a figure particularly well-endowed with authority and military strength, in order that the world return to its original state of equilibrium. In this opening discussion, the author is clearly imputing this status of *ṣāhib-qirān* to the hero of the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, Khoja Burhan al-Din. Muḥammad Amin draws particular attention to his destruction of Buddhist temples in the Ili Valley, and the conversion of Oirat Mongols to Islam, in order to substantiate Burhan al-Din’s credentials as a holy warrior. In a later passage, however, the same line of analysis is applied to the rise of the Qing, with the Qianlong 乾隆 Emperor (r. 1735–96, referred to here under his Mongolian title of Ezen Khan) portrayed as the agent of divine wrath:

When the populace of the kingdoms of that region were exerting themselves in an injurious fashion, by elevating the banners of revolt and proclaiming rebellion, the incomparable Eternal Lord assigned to them an exemplar of divine majesty, i.e., Ezen Khan, so that something would come to pass in their lives which was displeasing to them.³³

27 AF: fol. 116b.

28 (< Classical Mongolian *talbiq* “to release”) The word is unpointed in the text, and I owe this (conjectural) reading to Christopher Attwood.

29 After Chinggis Khan’s political dissolution of the original Uyghuristan (i.e. the Turfan-Hami region), to my knowledge the only other Islamic work to refer to the Tarim Basin by that name is Maḥmud ibn Valī’s *Baḥr al-Asrar*. See, for example, Ibn Valī 1045/1635–6: fol. 81a.

30 See, for example, the Chaghatay hagiography of the Katak Khoja lineage, where Aqsu is referred to as *Ardavīl*. Hama-da 2006: 13–14.

31 Shinmen 2003.

32 Note that this word is written most often with /p/ in place of /f/, i.e. *sapidkūh*. Because of the inconsistent pointing, it is therefore also possible to read it as *sipandkūh*, i.e. “Wild Rue Mountain.” Some of Kashghari’s alternative toponyms seem to reflect his reading of historical sources. He says, for example, that the town of Yangi Ḥiṣṣar (Modern Uyghur Yengisar) is known in “chronicles” as Ṭaraz (fol. 135b). Here he seems to be relying on the *Tarikh-i Rashidi*, where Mirza Ḥaydar says that “Yangi” was an alternative name for Ṭaraz. See Dughlat 1996: 226. Ṭaraz, originally Talas, was located on the Chu River, but already in his day Mirza Ḥaydar was unsure which city the name referred to. Kashghari evidently resolved the confusion by linking “Yangi” to Yangi Ḥiṣṣar.

33 AF: fols 120b–121a.

Considering the precedent of Chinggis Khan as the *ṣāhib-qirān par excellence*, there is nothing particularly unusual about a non-Muslim sovereign here being assigned this historical role. It is revealing, though, of the contradiction inherent in Muḥammad Amin's historiographic strategy. After all, Burhan al-Din's initial capture of Kashghar and Yarkand was commissioned and facilitated by the Qing court. That he subsequently broke with the Qing does not change the fact that his campaign paved the way for the full-fledged Qing annexation to follow. Viewed in the *longue durée*, therefore, Muḥammad Amin is compelled to acknowledge that the true instrument of divine justice was most probably not Burhan al-Din himself, but the Qing emperor, whose imperial ambitions laid the foundations for continued Chinese rule in Xinjiang today.

Of its non-Muslim actors, the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* reserves the most fulsome praise for the Khoit chief Amursana, whose role in engineering the rise of Dabachi Khan, one of the last Junghar monarchs, Kashghari describes in some detail. Like most historians, Kashghari considers Amursana's flight from Dabachi to the Kazakhs, and his eventual decision to seek support from Beijing, as the final straw in the collapse of the Junghar state. Kashghari discusses the long-running stand-off between the Junghars and the Qing as one in which the Junghars, until this point in time, had held the upper hand. To keep the peace, annually the Qing would send the Junghars "several cartloads of fine cloths and choice goods, and vessels and vases made of gold and silver" (note the similarity here to the widely held view that the Qing paid off the Kokand Khans to keep the khojas at bay). Yet behind this façade of friendship, Kashghari maintains, the Qing never resiled from their ambition to rid themselves of their Junghar foe. Although depicted as a sagacious political actor, Kashghari ultimately views Amursana's decision to side with the Qing as misguided, and relies on the following anecdote to make his point:

Three pious men were once travelling along a road at the time of the midday prayer, when they saw a rotting skeleton lying by the wayside. "What creature are these bones from?" they wondered. Each of them took a guess. Then one of them said: "Let us pray so that it will come back to life and we will see it in the flesh." At the prayer of one man, three gusts of winds blew, and the bones reconnected. When the second man prayed, veins, flesh, and skin grew on those bones. At the prayer of the third, living spirit was breathed into its heart, and a powerful lion arose and tore those three God-fearing men to pieces.³⁴

In other words, be careful what you wish for. Kashghari thus depicts Qing support for Amursana as motivated by bad faith from the very beginning, with the Qianlong Emperor instructing his officials that in the event of victory they should immediately detain Amursana and send him to be imprisoned in Beijing.

34 AF fol. 120b. The same anecdote is found in Mulla Musa Sayrami's *Tarikh-i Ḥamidi*, in accounting for the wish of some inhabitants of the Tarim Basin to see the end of Yaqub Beg's emirate and the restoration of Qing rule. See Sayrami 1986: 523–524.

Having driven off Dabachi Khan, the advancing Qing army then comes into contact with Khoja Burhan al-Din, who has by now has rallied a following from groups referred to as the the "nobles of the Taranchi and Karvaniyya," i.e. representatives of the settled Muslim farming population of the Ili region (the Taranchis), as well as the wealthy merchant elite in the service of the Junghars (the Karvaniyya, i.e. "Caravaneers", were also known as the Bazargan).³⁵ Alongside these allies he appointed his brother, Khoja Jahan, as his deputy (*nāyib*). Khoja Burhan al-Din's meeting with Qing commander is described in considerable detail, ostensibly on the basis of eyewitness testimony. The Qing officers request the assistance of the khoja in capturing the runaway Dabachi Khan, and he obliges by writing to one of his well-wishers in Aqsu, Khoja Yusuf, a man better known from Qing sources as Khojasi (霍集斯). Khoja Yusuf is one of a group of begs referred to in the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* as the "Turfaniyya amirs," i.e. whose family origins lie in Turfan. These begs initially endorsed Khoja Burhan al-Din's bid to rule the Tarim Basin, but then broke with him and sided with the Qing invasion. As such, the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*'s portrayal of them is ultimately critical, and highlights their opportunism. These Turfaniyya amirs "confused the Islamic sultans with the infidel emperors, and their constitution was not well suited to striding the open roads of faith and loyalty." The capture of Dabachi furnishes an example of this fickle disposition. On the one hand, Kashghari is happy to emphasise the decisive role of his hero, Khoja Burhan al-Din, in this pivotal event. Yet on the other hand, in so doing Khoja Yusuf was betraying the long-standing patronage he had enjoyed from the Junghars. "As much as this course of events accorded with the inclinations of His Sultanic Grace," Kashghari concedes, "still it was far from virtuous or humane conduct."³⁶

For the rest of this discourse, Kashghari turns to the politics of Kashgar and Yarkand, beginning with an account of the rise of the Ishaqiyya khojas in the Tarim Basin. He reprises the story surrounding Isma'il Khan's expulsion of Khoja Afaq in 1670, and emphasises the deep enmity of the Ishaqiyya khojas for Khoja Afaq's line—claiming, for example, that they often encouraged the Junghars to execute Khoja Burhan al-Din's father Khoja Ahmad. Kashghari briefly mentions the belated efforts of the Ishaqiyya to rule independently in the wake of the fall of the Junghars, but dismisses their claims to be waging holy war against them: "by this pretence they gained ascendancy in the land that they had first subdued out of loyalty and faithfulness to the idolatrous Oirat sultans."³⁷ Khoja Yusuf b. Khoja Danyal is depicted as a drunkard and the rule of his family as one of extreme tyranny, causing the inhabitants of Moghulistan to cry out for liberation. Many of the specific events mentioned here also feature in the *Tazkira-i 'Azizan*. Such is the correspondence between the two works that it is possible to speculate that the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* was in some sense written as a response to the earlier work, which was finished in the mid-1780s and may have made its way into Transoxiana while Kashghari was writing. Both works attribute significance, for example, to the execution of a Kash-

35 On the Bazargan, see Onuma 2011.

36 AF: fol. 124b.

37 AF: fol. 126a.

gar beg by the name of Khudayar, although the retelling varies in important ways.³⁸

The next sections describe in some detail the defeat that Khoja Burhan al-Din's combined Muslim and Qalmaq force inflicted on the army of the Ishāqiyya in Aqsu, thanks in large part to the defection of the Qipchaq Kirghiz from the Ishāqiyya side. Along with this, Kashghari discusses the efforts of Khoja Ya'qub (referred to consistently as *vālī-i ḥ"udpasand*, i.e. the "conceited governor") to rally support from surrounding regions. "Crowds of good-for-nothings, who out of arrogance and devilish delusions had turned their heads from both authorities, and were loyal to neither His Sultan's Grace, nor to the Conceited Governor, came from the direction of Kokand and Ferghana."³⁹ Prominent among these were members of the Sufi community that had formed around Khoja Afaq's son Khoja Ḥasan, whom Kashghari refers to as the "Black Mountain" faction (*qarātāğī*).⁴⁰ In Kashgar, the Ishāqiyya also welcomed the arrival of Qubad Bi of the Qushchi Kirghiz, but he proved unreliable, and switched sides to fight alongside Khoja Burhan al-Din. Interestingly, Kashghari also mentions that the Ishāqiyya sought to enlist the support of a Chaghatayid claimant to the Yarkand throne, Temür Khan son of Erke Khan. Citing the seventeenth-century precedent of Isma'il Khan's seizure of the Yarkand throne in collaboration with the Ishāqiyya, Khoja Ya'qub offers Temür Khan the worldly throne of Moghulistan. Hostile to the ambitions of Khoja Burhan al-Din, Temür Khan did in fact set out intending to take up the throne, but was waylaid and imprisoned by Burhan al-Din's brother Khoja Jahan.⁴¹

The concluding sections of this discourse treat Khoja Burhan al-Din's siege of Yarkand, the pillaging of the city's surrounds, and negotiations with Khoja Ya'qub and the Yarkand governor, Ghazi Beg. At a certain point Khoja Burhan al-Din's ranks are swelled with the arrival of the "chiefs and nobles, advisors and noteworthies of the province of Machin," i.e. from the Khotan oasis, offering their submission to the White Mountain khoja.⁴² After a lengthy account of the shift in advantage back and forth from the Yarkandis to the invading force, the text cuts off in the middle of an account of Khoja Burhan al-Din's secret dealings with the governor Ghazi Beg: dealings which in the *Tazkira-i 'Azizan* are cited as the chief reason for the fall of Yarkand and the victory of Khoja Burhan al-Din. We do not know whether Kashghari intended to adhere to this same narrative. Nor can we say if, or how, he intended to handle the period of Khoja Burhan al-Din's rule, and his eventual expulsion by the Qing.

5. Conclusion

Within the wider field of Naqshbandiyya hagiography from Xinjiang, works that glorify the White Mountain lineage of Khoja Burhan al-Din represent a minority current. Apart from the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*, we can cite a slightly earlier work from the Ili Valley, focusing on the personage of Khoja Aḥmad, Muḥammad 'Abd al-'Alim's *Islamnāma*.⁴³ Another example of this tradition is the *Silsilat al-Zahab*, a nineteenth-century recension of traditions that survived among akhunds loyal to the White Mountain khojas in the Tarim Basin.⁴⁴ Apart from these works, we could also cite certain genealogical scrolls, some of which include historical narrations that reflect an ongoing devotion to Khoja Burhan al-Din on the part of some Muslims of Xinjiang.⁴⁵ Within this already small corpus, the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* occupies its own unique position, as a literary product of the exile community itself, and not of remaining devotees in Xinjiang.

The tendency to blur the boundaries between genres of history writing and hagiography in post-Mongol Central Asia is a widely recognised one.⁴⁶ There are, though, various ways in which this might be done. In the case of a work like the *Tazkira-i 'Azizan*, for example, we see a text that begins by confirming to the classical hagiographic model of parcelised "narrations" (*naql*) and gradually evolves in the course of the work into more of a narrative history, making nods to the epic *dastan* tradition along the way. The *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* takes a different approach. In both structure and content, Muḥammad Amin Kashghari goes to greater lengths than any other Central Asian author I am aware of to write what we can call "hagiographic history," i.e. to write the lives of saints in conformity with the recognised, and centuries-old standards of Islamic world history that emerged in the Chinggisid and Timurid periods.

The author's choice in doing so, I have suggested, was dictated in part by political circumstances in the Tarim Basin itself. The political vacuum left by the decline of the Chingissid Chaghatayids in the seventeenth century did not signal the rise of new dynasties from the *amir* (or beg) class, as it did in Transoxania. Instead, the most substantial new discourses of political legitimacy centred on the Makhdumzada khoja lineages. When this quasi-royal tradition surrounding the khojas was exposed to the discursive environment of late eighteenth-century Transoxiana, the Kashgari exiles were confronted with the task of reconciling content with form: i.e. packaging such claims in a way deemed fitting for a region where traditions of courtly historiography were still alive and well, and where such forms of historiography served as the orthodox way to make a case for someone's right to rule. In this sense the *Aṣar al-Futuḥ* was an experiment in historiography, and like the political venture to which it was attached, it can be said to have failed. In the unfinished nature of the

38 AF: fols. 125a–125b. Cf. Kashghari 2021: 96–102.

39 AF: fol. 135b.

40 AF: fol. 139a. Eventually, these men were tried by the *yasa* and executed. On the identity of the "Black Mountaineers" at this time, see Brophy 2018.

41 AF: fols 146a–b.

42 AF: fol. 147a.

43 'Abd al-'Alim. 1190/1776–7.

44 Hamut 2011.

45 See, for example, Shinmen and Sugawara 2002.

46 For a discussion of one example of this, see Hayoz 2009.

work we may well see a reflection of the declining fortunes of Sarimsaq and the community surrounding him. Even in its disjointed, incoherent form, however, it still constitutes a valuable source for the ideological contestation surrounding Qing Xinjiang and the Qing court's engagement with the wider world of Islamic Central Asia.

References

- ‘Abd al-‘Alim, Muḥammad. 1190/1776–7. *Islamnāma*. IVR RAN. MS C311.
- Babadžanov, Baxtiyor M. 1996. “On the History of the Naqšbandīya Muğaddidīya in Central Māwarā’annahr in the Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries.” *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th centuries* (Michael Kemper, Anke von Kügelgen, and Dmitriy Yermakov, eds.), 385–413. Berlin: Klaus Schwartz.
- Bartol’d, V. V. 1973. “Otchet o komandirovke v Turkestan (Avgust–Dekabr’ 1920 g.).” *Sochineniia*, volume 8, 366–396. Moscow: Nauka.
- Boldyrev, A. N., ed. 1997. *Ta’rikh-i Badakhshan: Faksimile rukopisi, izdanie teksta, perevod s persidskogo*. Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura.
- DeWeese, Devin. 2013. “Aḥmad Yasavī in the Work of Burhān al-Dīn Qīlīch: The Earliest Reference to a Famously Obscure Central Asian Sufi Saint.” *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques*, 67(3): 837–879.
- Dughlat, Mirza Haydar. 1996. *Tarikh-i-Rashidi: A History of the Khans of Moghulistan*. Translated by W. M. Thackston. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.
- Gankovskii, Iu. V. 1958. *Imperiia Durrani: Ocherki administrativnoi i voennoi sistemy*. Moscow: Vostochnaia literatura.
- Hamada Masami. 2006. *Hagiographies du Turkestan Oriental. Textes čagatay édités, traduits en japonais et annotés avec une introduction analytique et historique*. Kyoto: Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University.
- Hamut, Bahargül. 2011. *Silsilat Az-Zahab: Kommentierung einer čagatai-uirgischen Handschrift zu den Aqtagliq Hoğilar*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- Hayoz, Thomas. 2009. “Hagiographic Tendencies in the Tarikh-i Rashidi: Mirza Haydar Dughlat’s Hagio-Historiographic Way of Writing History.” *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference of the European Society for Central Asia Studies* (Tomasz Gacek and Jadwiga Pstrusińska, eds.), 149–156, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ibn Vali, Maḥmud. 1035/1635–6. *Baḥr al-Asrar fi Manaqib al-Akhyar*. IVAN RUZ. MS 1375.
- Iusupova, D. I. and R. P. Dzhalilova, eds. 1998. *Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Respubliki Uzbekistan: Istoriia*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Karminagi, Muḥammad Qaṣi Vafa. 2015. *Tuḥfat Al-Khani, ya, Tarikh-i Raḥimkhani*. Edited by Maṣṣur Şifatgul and Nobuaki Kondo. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Kashghari, Muḥammad Amin (Şadr). 1220/1805–6. *Aṣar al-Futuḥ*. IVAN RUZ. MS 753.
- Kashghari, Muḥammad Amin (Şadr). n.d. *Durar al-Akhbar*. IVAN RUZ. MS 2156.
- Kashghari, Muḥammad Şadiq. 2021. *In Remembrance of the Saints: The Rise and Fall of an Inner Asian Sufi Dynasty*. Translated by David Brophy. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Khodzhaev, A. 1991. *Tsinskaia imperiia i Vostochnyi Turkestan v XVIII v.* Tashkent: Fan.
- Kutlukov, M. 1989. “Zain ad-Din Mukhammad-Amin Sadr Kashgari ‘Asar al-Futukh’.” *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia v Tsentral’noi Azii: XVII–XVIII vv. Dokumenty i materialy* (B. P. Gurevich, G. F. Kim, eds.), vol. 2, 254–261. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kutlukov, M. 2000. “Istochniki po istorii Vostochnogo Turkestana v XVI–XIX vv.” *Issledovaniia po uigurovedeniui* (A. Tilivaldi et al., eds.), 75–95, Almaty: Tsentr uigurovedeniia Instituta vostokovedeniia.
- McChesney, R. D. 1991. *Waqf in Central Asia: Four Hundred Years in the History of a Muslim Shrine, 1480–1889*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Onuma Takahiro. 2011. “The Development of the Junghars and the Role of Bukharan Merchants.” *Journal of Central Eurasian Studies*, 2: 83–100.
- Onuma Takahiro 小沼孝博. 2014. *Shin to Chūō Ajia sōgen: Yūbokumin no sekai kara teikoku no henkyō e* 清と中央アジア草原：遊牧民の世界から帝国の辺境へ. Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku shuppankai.
- Saguchi Tōru. 1968. “The Revival of the White Mountain Khwājas, 1760–1820 (From Sarimsāq to Jihāngīr),” *Acta Asiatica* 14: 7–20.
- Sayrami, Molla Musa. 1986. *Tarikh-i Hāmidī*. Edited by Änvār Baytur. Beijing: Millātlār Nāshriyati.
- Semenov, A. A. et al., eds. 1952. *Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Uzbekskoi SSR*. Volume 1. Tashkent: Izdatel’svo Akademii nauk UzSSR.
- Shinmen Yasushi. 2003. “The History of the Mausoleum Aṣḥāb al-Kahf in Turfan.” *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, 61: 83–104.
- Shinmen Yasushi 新免康 and Sugawara Jun 菅原純. 2002. “Kashugaru hōjake Āfākutō no katsudō no ittan: Yāringu korekushon Prov. 219 ni tsuite カシュガル・ホージャ家アーファーク統の活動の一端：ヤーリング・コレクション Prov.219 について.” *Tōyōshi kenkyū* 61(3): 33–63.
- Zhongguo diyi lishi dang’anguan, and Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu zhongxin, eds. 2012. *Qingdai Xinjiang Manwen dang’an huibian* 清代新疆满文档案汇编. Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe.