

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

B. LEWIS, CH. PELLAT AND J. SCHACHT

ASSISTED BY J. BURTON-PAGE, C. DUMONT AND V. L. MÉNAGE AS
EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME II

C—G

PHOTOMECHANICAL REPRINT



LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1983

al-Dīn Yazdī, ed. Ilāhdād, 1885, i, 124), and this appears to be on the site of the ancient town of Āghāniyān (thus Barthold, *Turkestan*, 72; Markwart, *Wehrot*, 93). There is mention of Āghāniyān on only one further occasion, in the *Bābur-nāma* (ed. Beveridge, 1905, index), where it is probably a historical reminiscence. Apparently no mediaeval ruins have survived in Āghāniyān, and the old settlements have vanished. Today the district belongs to the Ōzbek SSR, and the Ōzbek language has supplanted the old Iranian. The regions to the east of the Kāfirnahān river, however, together with Ḳabādiyān, belong to the Tādjīk language area and to the Tādjīk SSR.

Bibliography: W. Barthold, *Turkestan*, index; Le Strange, 435-40; J. Markwart, *Wehrot und Arang*, 1938, index; *Hudūd al-Ālam*, index; B. Spuler, *Iran*, index. (B. SPULER)

ĀGHĀN-RŪD (ĀGHĀN-RŪDH), the seventh and last tributary on the right of the river Āmū-Daryā [q.v.]. It comes from the Buttam mountains, to the north of Āghāniyān [q.v.], flows past that town and several smaller places, and finally into the Āmū-Daryā above Tirmidh. The river is called by this name only in the *Hudūd al-Ālam*, (71, no. 11, p. 363), and in Sharaf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī, *Zafar-nāma* (ed. Ilāhdād), 1885, i, 196 (= translation by F. Pétis de la Croix, i, 183). Muḳaddasī, 22, calls it "river of Āghāniyān", and distinguishes it from the Kāfir-nihān, the 6th tributary (further to the east) of the Āmū-Daryā. Ibn Rusta, (*BGA* vii, 93), on the other hand, gets the two rivers, their sources, and their tributaries mixed up; he calls the Āghān-Rūd: Zāmi/Zamul. Today, the upper part of the river is known as Ḳara Ṭagh Daryā, and from Dih-i naw (Dēnaw = Āghāniyān) onwards: Surkhān.

Bibliography: Le Strange, 436, 440; W. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 72; J. Markwart, *Wehrot und Arang*, 1938, 89-94 (he attempts a classification of the pre-Islamic Iranian sources); B. Spuler, *Der Āmū-Darjā*, 234 (in *Jean Deny Armağan*, Ankara 1958, 231-48); Brockhaus-Efron, *Ēnciklop. Slovar' xxxii/1* (= 63), St. Petersburg 1901, 109; *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Ēntsiklop.* 41, (1956) 315.

(B. SPULER)

ĀGHATAY KHĀN, founder of the Āghatay Khanate [q.v.], the second son of Čingiz-Khān and his chief wife Börte Fudjin. Already in his father's lifetime he was regarded as the greatest authority on the *Yasa* (the tribal laws of the Mongols as codified by Čingiz-Khān). Like his brothers he took part in his father's campaigns against China (1211-1216) and against the kingdom of the Kh^wārizm-Shāh (1219-1224). Urgāndj, the latter's capital, was besieged by the three princes Djoči, Āghatay and Ōgedey and taken in Šafar 618/27th March-24th April 1221. In the same year Āghatay's eldest son Mō'etūken was slain before Bāmiyān. After the battle on the Indus (according to Nasawī, transl. Houdas, 83, on Wednesday 7 Shawwāl 618, probably 24 November 1221) Āghatay was entrusted with operations against Sultān Djalāl al-Dīn Kh^wārizm-Shāh and spent the winter of 1221-1222 in India. During Čingiz-Khān's final campaign against the Tangut (1225-1227) he remained in Mongolia in command of the forces left behind there.

After his father's death Āghatay no longer took an active part in any of the campaigns. As the eldest surviving son of Čingiz-Khān (his brother Djoči had predeceased his father) he enjoyed enormous prestige. In the year 1229 he presided with his

uncle Otčigin over the *kuriltay* at which Ōgedey was elected Great Khān: owing to his position as the recognized authority on the *yasa*, he exercised an influence to which even the Great Khān Ōgedey had to bow. He seems to have spent this period partly in Mongolia at his brother's court, partly in the territory allotted to him by Čingiz-Khān, where he held his own court-camp. Like all the Mongol princes Āghatay had separate camps (*ordu*) for winter and summer. His summer residence according to Djuwaynī was at some place on the Ili whilst his winter quarters were at Ḳuyas, probably to be identified with the Equus of William of Rubruck, near Almaligh, i.e., in the region of the present-day Kulja. The residence of Āghatay's successors is called Ulugh Ef (in Turkish „Great House") by Djuwaynī and others.

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

It cannot be ascertained how far Āghatay's Muslim minister Ḳuṭb al-Dīn Ḥabash 'Amīd had a share in the administration of the country along with the representatives of the Great Khān. According to Rašīd al-Dīn this minister came from Otrar, according to Djamāl Ḳarshī from Karmina, and like many other Muslim dignitaries at this time had made his fortune among the Mongols as a merchant. He was on terms of such intimacy with the Khān that each of Āghatay's sons had one of Ḥabash 'Amīd's sons as a companion.

In general Āghatay was not favourably inclined towards Islam. Among the infringements of Mongol law which he rigidly punished was the observance of certain prescriptions of Islam. Among the Mongols it was forbidden to slaughter an animal by cutting its throat, which is the method prescribed by the *shari'a*; another law frequently broken by the Muslims at their ablutions was that which prohibited washing in running water. The cruel punishment which Āghatay visited upon any such transgressions made his name hated among the Muslims.

According to *Djuwaynī*, Čaghatay survived his brother Ögedey, who died on 5 *Djumādā* II 639/11th December 1241 though only for a short period. On the other hand *Rashīd al-Dīn* states that he died seven months before Ögedey, *i.e.*, apparently in the beginning of May, 1241.

Bibliography: *Djuwaynī-Boyle*; *Rashīd al-Dīn, Djāmi' al-Tawārikh*, ed. E. Blochet, Leiden 1911; V. V. Barthold, *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, Vol. i, transl. V. and T. Minorsky, Leiden 1956. (W. BARTHOLD-[J. A. BOYLE])

ĀGHATAY KHĀNATE. The Central Asian Khānate to which Čaghatay gave his name was really not founded till some decades after the Mongol prince's death. Čaghatay was succeeded by his grandson *Qara-Hülegü*, the son of *Mö'etüken* who fell at *Bāmiyān*. *Qara-Hülegü* had been designated as Čaghatay's heir both by Čingiz-Khān himself and by Ögedey; he was however deposed by the Great Khān *Güyük* (1241-1248) in favour of *Yesü-Möngke*, the fifth son of Čaghatay, with whom *Güyük* was on terms of personal friendship. In 1251 *Yesü-Möngke* was involved in the conspiracy against the Great Khān *Möngke*, who reinstated *Kara-Hülegü* and handed *Yesü-Möngke* over to him for execution. *Qara-Hülegü* however did not survive the homeward journey and the execution was carried out by his widow, Princess *Orkīna*, who now ruled in her husband's stead, though her authority does not seem to have extended beyond the *Ili valley*. As appears from the narrative of *William of Rubruck*, the whole Empire was at this period divided between *Möngke* and *Batu*: *Batu's* portion was the whole area west of a line between the rivers *Talas* and *Ču*, east of which all territories were directly subject to the Great Khān. *Mas'ūd Beg* [see the previous article], who enjoyed the confidence of both Khāns, was governor of all the settled areas between *Besh-Balgh* and *Kh'ārizm*.

With the death of the Great Khān *Möngke* in 1259 a different condition of things arose. During the struggle for supremacy between *Qubilay* and *Arigh Böke*, the brothers of the late Khān, *Alughu*, a grandson of Čaghatay, agreed to take possession of Central Asia for *Arigh Böke* and support him from that quarter against his enemies. He actually succeeded in bringing the whole of Central Asia under his sway, including areas such as *Kh'ārizm* and the present-day *Afghānistān* which had never previously been numbered amongst the possessions of the House of Čaghatay. He had of course won these victories for himself and not for *Arigh Böke*. He everywhere proclaimed himself as an independent ruler; and *Arigh Böke*, who had tried to assert his rights, was finally forced to vacate this territory after some initial successes. *Mas'ūd Beg* still remained the governor of the settled areas, now no longer in the name of the Great Khān but as the representative of *Alughu*.

Alughu may be regarded as the founder of an independent Mongol state in Central Asia: he enjoyed his success only for a brief period, as he died in 664/1265-1266. *Mubārak-Shāh*, the son of *Kara-Hülegü* and *Orkīna*, the first Čaghatay convert to Islam, was proclaimed Khān in March 1266. Already in the same year he was dethroned by his cousin *Burāk* (or rather *Barak*) Khān [*q.v.*], the nominee of the Great Khān, who was soon however to become little more than a satellite of *Qaydu* [*q.v.*], now the real master of Central Asia. After *Burāk's* death in 1271 *Qaydu* appointed *Nīkpāy*, a grandson of Čaghatay, to succeed him; *Nīkpāy* was followed by

Buqa-Temür, another grandson of Čaghatay; and in 1282, *Qaydu's* choice fell upon *Du'a*, the son of *Burāk*. The faithful ally of *Qaydu* in all his wars against the Great Khān, *Du'a* defeated and deposed his son *Čapar* shortly before his own death in 1306 or 1307. The Čaghatay Khānate was from now on to remain in *Du'a's* family almost to the moment of its extinction, the throne being occupied, for longer or shorter periods, by six of his sons, of whom we need mention here only *Esen-Buqa* (1309-1318), *Kebek* (1318-1326) and *Tarmashirin* (1326-1334).

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

Even the brief reign of *Yesü-Möngke* (1246-1251) appears to have been favourable to those who professed Islam. The chief minister then was a friend of the Khān's youth and a foster-son of *Ḥabash 'Amīd*, *Bahā' al-Dīn Marghīnānī*, a descendant of the *Shuyūkh al-Islām* of *Farghāna*. As a patron of poets and scholars he is praised by his contemporary *Djuwaynī*, who was personally acquainted with him. *Ḥabash 'Amīd*, who was hated by the Khān as an adherent of *Qara-Hülegü*, owed his life to the intercession of *Bahā' al-Dīn*. Nevertheless, when *Bahā' al-Dīn* was involved in his master's downfall, he was handed over to his foster-father, who ordered his execution in the cruellest fashion.

Under *Orkīna*, *Ḥabash 'Amīd* again occupied the position he had held under Čaghatay; this princess however was favourably inclined to the Muslims; she is described by *Waṣṣāf* as a protectress of Islam and by *Djamāl Karshī* was even said to be a Muslim. Her son *Mubārak-Shāh*, raised to the throne in *Mā warā' al-Nahr*, certainly adopted Islam, as did his rival *Burāk Khān* some years later. The rule of *Alughu* seems to have been less favourable to the Muslims, and the events of the following years postponed for several decades the final victory of Muslim culture. *Qaydu* and *Čapar*, as well as *Du'a* and other princes, remained pagans and resided in the eastern provinces. In the reign of *Esen-Buqa* the armies of the Great Khān penetrated deep into Central Asia and ravaged the winter and summer

West, or of the West in Muslim countries? It would of course be paradoxical to contend that among the members of the two geographically close populations there was no exchange of knowledge. But examination of institutions in the Latin East shows fewer borrowings from the Muslim past and less social intermingling than in the Christian States of Sicily and Spain. Similarly, from a cultural point of view, objective comparison leads to the categorical conclusion that where the West has acquired knowledge of Muslim civilization, it has done so mainly through Spain or Sicily and not through Western settlements in the East or Crusaders from the West; moreover, Islam as such nearly always remained misunderstood and the few accurate ideas about it that the West finally acquired are due to the efforts of missionaries, in other words to work undertaken in an entirely different spirit from the spirit of the Crusades. As for the Muslims, although some showed a certain curiosity about the Franks in the East or about a Western leader as exceptional as Frederick II, it must be acknowledged that their historians, geographers and anti-Christian polemicists still had after the Crusades the same few notions about the European West, gleaned from their co-religionists in the West, that they had had before. Therefore, and contrary I regret to current opinion, it seems to me an anachronism to repeat with those who have worked on the cultural or political influence, indeed a very real one, of modern France in the East, or written within that context, that the Crusades laid their foundations; if in their own way they bore witness to the beginning of a process of interpenetration, the atmosphere they created proved subsequently more of a hindrance than a help.

Bibliography: The Arabic sources of the history of the Crusades are catalogued in C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades*, 1940, 33-94, without however certain elucidations which may be found particularly in (besides a forthcoming work by N. Elisséeff on Nūr al-Dīn) H. A. R. Gibb, *The Arabic sources for the life of Saladin*, in *Speculum*, xxv (1950); B. Lewis, *The sources for the history of the Syrian Assassins*, *ibid.*, xxvii (1952); H. Gottschalk, *al-Malik al-Kāmil*, 1958, Introduction. The five volumes of *Historiens Arabes* in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* published by the Académie des Inscriptions suffer from lack of method in the choice of extracts and insufficient care in the establishment and translation of texts (not to mention their inconvenient format); they have still not yet however been replaced by editions or above all, for those who need them, by better translations. Since 1940 have appeared—and we quote only the essential—a French translation by R. Le Tourneau of Ibn al-Kalānisi's Damascus chronicle (*Damas de 1075 à 1154*, French Institute in Damascus, 1952), vol. i of a new and this time good edition of Abū Shāma's *K. al-Rawḍatayn* by M. A. Hilmī (Cairo 1957), as well as an edition of his *Dhayl* (Cairo 1947); the first two volumes, less important than those to follow, of a good edition of Ibn Wāsil's *Mufarriḍ al-Kurūb* by al-Shayyāl (Cairo 1953 and 1957); an edition of the Ayyūbid part of al-Makīn b. al-'Amīd's chronicle by C. Cahen (in *BEO*, Damascus, xv, 1955-57); the edition of part of Ibn 'Abd al-Zāhir's life of Baybars, under the title *Baybars the First*, by S. F. Sadeque, Oxford and Dacca 1956; the first two volumes out of the three of the excellent

edition of (Kamāl al-Dīn) Ibn al-'Adīm's *Zubda* by Sāmī Dahān (Fr. Inst. Damascus, 1951 and 54) and, by the same editor, the part on Damascus of Ibn Shaddād's *A'lāh* (Fr. Inst. Damascus, 1956), with the part on Aleppo edited by D. Sourdel (*ibid.*, 1958); of the extant half of the *Life of Baybars* by the same author (in the absence of any edition) there is a Turkish translation by Şerefuddin Yaltkaya, Istanbul 1941; an edition by C. Zurayk and S. Izzedin, 1939-42, of the two volumes by Ibn al-Furāt on the years 672-696; an edition at Haydārābād, 2 vol. 1954-55, of the part of Yūnīnī covering the years 664-670; and finally for the years 689-698 an analysis of *Djazarī* by J. Sauvaget, 1949. None of these authors of course deals specifically with the Crusades. A good number of selected and translated texts, together with useful introductions, has been given by Fr. Gabrieli, *Storici Arabi delle Crociate*, 1957.

For the general history of the Crusades in their Eastern setting reference should be made to the general works of Grousset, Runciman, my *Syrie du Nord* and the collective *History of the Crusades* by the University of Philadelphia under the supervision of K. M. Setton, vol. i (twelfth century) 1955, vol. ii (thirteenth century) in the press, and three further volumes on the later Crusades, institutions and civilization. A broadly conceived general bibliography of the Crusades will be found in H. E. Mayer, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, Hanover 1960. It seems useful here only to indicate the few studies devoted particularly to aspects of the problems treated above: C. Cahen has given the outlines of a forthcoming *Autour des Croisades, Points de vue d'Orient et d'Occident*, in *En quoi la Conquête turque appelait-elle la Croisade* (*Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres*, Strasbourg, Nov. 1950), *An Introduction to the First Crusade (Past and Present)*, 1954) and *Les Institutions de l'Orient Latin*, in *Oriente e Occidente, XII Convegno Volta*, 1956. The only other studies which need be quoted here are: H. A. R. Gibb, *The achievement of Saladin* in *Bull. of the John Rylands Library*, 1952; A. S. 'Atīya, *The Crusades, Old ideas and new conceptions*, in *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale/ Journal of World History*, ii/2, 1954; and, on a much broader theme, U. Monneret de Villard, *Lo studio dell' Islam nel XII e XIII secolo*, in *Studi e Testi*, cx (1948), and A. Malvezzi, *L'islamismo e la cultura europea*, n.d. [1957] (the history of the knowledge of Islam).

(C. CAHEN)

CRYSTAL [see BILLAWR]

ČU, a river in Central Asia, 1090 km. long, but not navigable because of its strong current. It is now known as *Shu* (Barthold, *Vorl. So*) by the Kirgiz who live there (and it probably had this name when the Turks lived there in the Middle Ages); Chinese: *Su-yeh* or *Sui-she*. modern Chinese: Č'uci (for the problem of the indication of Ču = Chinese 'pearl' with the 'Pearl River' [Yinčü Ögüz] in the Orkhon Inscriptions, cf. the article SİR DARVĀ). The river Ču has its source in Terskei Alatau, and then flows to the north-east until 6 km. from the western end of the Issik Kul [q.v.], known as Koçkar in its upper regions (for the first time in Sharaf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī, ed. Ilāhdād, i, Calcutta 1885, 274). It send a branch (called the Kutemaldi) to the lake, whose outlet it earlier was. Subsequently the Ču turns northwards through the Būghām (Russian: Buam) ravine (this is mentioned first in Sharaf al-

Dīn, *loc. cit.*; in Gardīzī, 102: Dīl, supposedly 'narrow'), which lies to the north-west of the western end of the Issik Kul, and then flows in a north-westerly direction. In this region it receives the waters of the Great and the Little Kebin from its right, and the Aksu and Kuragati from the left. The river then flows through dreary waste-land in its middle and lower course. 110 km. east of the Āmū Daryā [*q.v.*], it ends in the small desert lake Saumal-Kul.

The regions adjoining the upper Ču, which were good grazing land and could be easily irrigated, were already inhabited in the times of the Middle Siberian Andronovo culture (1700-1200 B.C.) (Bernstamm, 20). Later on, Sacae and Wusun (pseudo Tokharians?) lived on its banks. In the 6th and 7th centuries, these were joined by the Soghdians (see *SUGHID*) (Altī Čub Soghdak, in the Orkhon inscriptions: Bernstamm, 269). Archaeological traces of these peoples have been found and described by the Soviet expert Aleksandr Natanovič Bernstamm (1910-1956). From his research, it has become evident that Syrian and some Byzantine influences had reached as far as this, and that the traffic from Further Asia to the Land of the Seven Rivers (Yeti Suw; Russ. Semireč'e; cf. also Ili) passed through this region along two ancient trade-routes (through the Kastek pass to the Ili valley, and through the Būghām pass to the south side of the Issik Kul). Thus two cultures met on the banks of the Ču (down to the Land of the Seven Rivers and the Farghāna Basin [Bernstamm, 147, 262]).

In 776, the Karluq [*q.v.*] occupied the valley of the Ču and that of the Tarāz (Talas), and the area along both sides of the Alexander Mountains. The Tukhs(i) also settled there (*Hudūd al-Ālam*, 300; Barthold, *Vork.*, 75). Sūyāb [*q.v.*] was the capital of the Ču valley (Kāshgharī, iii, 305; Hsüan-Čuang, ed. St. Julien, Paris 1857-8); the residence of the ruler of this area was usually in Kuz Ordu (Balāsāghūn; [*q.v.*]). Judging from the traces of settlements found, the valley was well populated at that time. The inhabitants developed a particular multi-coloured style in ceramics, and later also a distinct special form of ornamental Kūfic writing. There was a marked distinction between them and the other Transoxanians (Bernstamm, 157, 161/66).

Islamic armies reached the western part of the Ču valley only once, in 195/810 (battle against Kūlān, cf. Ibn al-Athīr, vi, 164), and the name of the river is not mentioned in Muslim sources of pre-Mongol times, although there is mention of some of the places in the region (Ibn Khurrahādhibih [*BGA* VI, 29]; Kudāma, *K. al-Kharādī* [*BGA*], 206). Islam reached the population only in the 4th/10th century, and even around the year 372/982, only a part of the inhabitants of Tarāz and Nawēkath had become Muslims (*Hudūd al-Ālam*, 119, no. 93; 358, with mention of individual places); Nestorian Christianity was widespread for a considerably longer time. The rule of the Kara Khitāy [*q.v.*] followed that of the Karluqs in 535/1141. Thus there was a renewed influence of Chinese cultural elements (Nephrit, Sung porcelain) in the area, and these mixed again with those of Transoxania (Bernstamm, 168, 171 f.). Meanwhile, the numerous wars of the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries resulted in a decrease of the population of the Ču valley. Where the Chinese traveller Č'ang Č'un still met several towns and villages in 616/1219, and crossed the Ču by a wooden bridge (E. Bretschneider, *Med. Researches*, i, London 1888, 71 f., 129 f.; A. Waley, *The Travels of an Alchemist*, London 1931), many

ruins are reported already in 658/1259. At that time (651/1253), the region formed the border line between the areas of influence of the two Mongol Khāns Batu [*q.v.*] and Mōngke (Mangū [*q.v.*]). Shīban (Shaybān), the founder of the "Blue" (White) Horde (see *BAITŪIDS*) had his winter quarters here. But the main cause of virtual de-population of the area, was war amongst the Mongols in the 8th/14th century (see *ĀGHATĀY*), plague (according to epitaphs of 739/1338), and the campaigns of Tīmūr [*q.v.*]. Our sources for these last already fail to mention any place-names in the Ču valley. The Nestorian settlements near Pishpek and Tokmak [*q.v.*], of which we have epitaphs of the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, also seem to have perished at this time. Muḥammad Ḥaydar Dūghlāt, *Ta'rikh-i Rashidī*, ed. N. Elias and E. D. Ross, London 1895-98, 364 f., ca. 1546, mentions only ruins with a minaret rising above them. The modern name Burana for a tower in the ancient Tokmak also derives from Manāra (according to Perovskiĭ in the *Zap. Vost. Old.*, viii, 352).

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

Historical Maps of the region of the Ču: A. Herrmann, *Atlas of China*, 1925, several maps, 37 and 60 in particular; *Hudūd al-Ālam*, 279, 299; Bernstamm, maps ii and iii (at the end). Islamic Maps: C. Miller, *Mappae Arabicae*, iv 78/82, 86*-91*.

Bibliography: E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*, St. Petersburg 1903, 79, 85; *Hudūd al-Ālam*, index; W. Barthold, *Zwölf Vorlesungen*, Berlin 1935, index; idem, *Four Studies*, Leiden 1956, index s.v. *Archaeology*; A. N. Bernstamm (Bernstamm), *Istoriko-arkheologičeskie očerki Tsentral'nogo Tyan'-Shanya i Pamiro-Alaya*, Moscow-Leningrad 1952 (*passim*; compare above and index under Ču and Čuyskaya dolina) (*Materiali i issledovaniya po arkheologii SSSR* 26). Christianity near Tokmak: D. Chwolson, *Syrisch-nestorianische Grabinschriften aus Semirjetschie*, St. Petersburg 1890; *Neue Folge*, St. Petersburg 1897; P. K. Kokovtsov, *K sroturetskoy epigrafike Semireč'ya* (*Izv. Imp. Ak. Nauk* 1909, 773 f.); J. Dauvillier, *Les provinces Chaldéennes „de l'extérieur" au Moyen-Age*, in the *Mélanges Cavallera*, Toulouse 1948, 261-316; B. Spuler, *Die nestorianische Kirche*, in the *Handbuch der Orientalistik* viii, 1959 (the two last include further bibliography). Geography: W. Leimbach, *Die Sowjetunion*, Stuttgart 1950, 253; Brockhaus-Efron: *Éntsiklopedičeskiy slovar'* 38 B (76), p. 932; 39 A (77), p. 27; *BSE* lxii, 695, 745; 2. ed., xlvii, 444, 464 (only geographical information). (B. SPULER)

ČŪBĀNIDS (COBANIDS), a family of Mongol amirs claiming descent from a certain Sūrghān

in Mewlewī Derwīsh circles. It is also used as a term of respect for various wonder-working holy men in Istanbul and Anatolia, as reported by Ewliyā Ćelebi (cf. Ewliyā Efendi, *Travels*, translated by Hammer, i, 2, 21, 25; ii, 97, 213).

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

Bibliography: other than the works already mentioned in the article: J. T. Zenker, *Türkisch-Arabisch-Persisches Handwörterbuch*, Leipzig 1866, s.v. 1; Hüseyin Kadri, *Türk lügati*, Istanbul 1928; Şeyh Süleyman Buhâri, *Lûgat-i çagalay ve türktî osmanî*, Istanbul 1928; Abū Ḥayyān, *Kitāb al-idrāk li-lisān al-Atrāk*, ed. A. Caferoğlu; *IA*, iii, 506 (Mecdud Mansuroğlu). (FR. TAESCHNER)

DEDE AGHAĆ, now Alexandropolis, town on the Aegean coast of Thrace, founded in 1871, after the construction of the branch railway from the main Rumeli line. Being an outlet for the products of the hinterland it prospered rapidly, so that in 1300/1883 it supplanted Dimetoka as the centre of a *sandjak* (*mutaşarrıflık*) of the *wilāyet* of Edirne. In 1894 the *sandjak* of Dede AghaĆ comprised the *kadās* of Dede AghaĆ, Enez (Inos) and Sofrulu; the *kadā* of Dede AghaĆ comprised three *nāhiyes*, Feredjik, Meghri and Semadrek, and 41 villages. This was the position until the region was lost as a result of the Balkan War of 1912-3. Two mosques were built in the town, one in the Muşliḥ al-Dīn quarter in 1877, the other, in the Arab style, in the Ḥamīdiyye quarter in 1890, in the court-yard of which the *mutaşarrıf* Trabzonlu Hüseyin Rüşdī Paşa is buried. In 1894 there were some 1500 houses in Dede AghaĆ. In the village of Fere-İljdjaları there were foundations of Ghāzī Ewrenos Beg [q.v.] and of (Kodja) Dāwūd Paşa [q.v.].

Bibliography: *Edirne Sālnāmesi* for 1310 and 1317; 'Alī Djewād, *Memālik-i 'Othmāniyyenin ta'rīkh we djoghrafyā lughātī*, i, Istanbul 1313; Bādi Ahmed, *Riyād-i Belde-i Edirne*, iii (Bayezid Library, Istanbul). (M. TAYYIB GÖKBILGIN)

DEDE KORKUT, a Turkish collection of twelve tales in prose, interspersed with verse passages, the oldest surviving specimen of the Oghuz epic and one of the most remarkable monuments of the Turkish language. They are named after the sage, a legendary character, who appears in each tale; he is the poet-singer who re-composes and recites each narrative, and bestows his blessings upon all. He is strongly reminiscent of the poet-magicians of the shamanistic era. The only existing complete manuscript is in Dresden (H. O. Fleischer, *Catalogus codicum man. orientaliū* . . . no. 86) of which J. H. von Diez made a copy for the Berlin Library (A. Pertsch, *Die Hand. Verzeichnisse* . . . vi, no. 203). The works of von Diez (*Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien*, i, Berlin-Halle 1815, 399-457) and W. Barthold (*Zapiski Vostochnago Otdeleniya*, *Imp. Russ. Arkh. Obshchestva*, viii, 1894, 203-218; also ix, 1895; xi, 1898; xii, 1899; xv, 1904; xix, 1910) and the first edition of the book by Kilisli Mu'allim Rif'at (*Kitāb-i Dede Korkut 'alā lisān-i tā'ise-i Oghuzān*, Istanbul, 1332/1916) are based on the Berlin copy. The first edition in transcription with a long historical-bibliographical introduction by Orhan Şaik Gökyay (see bibliography) also uses the Berlin copy with some emendations from the Dresden copy.

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

The publication of the complete text in 1916 gave great impetus to Dede Korkut studies, and since then a growing number of scholars have been occupied with elucidating many historical, literary, linguistic, ethnological and folkloristic problems of the work. Despite the remarkable contributions of the above-mentioned authors and other scholars (among them M. F. Köprülü, A. Inan, P. N. Boratav, Hamid Araslı, Walter Ruben, Faruk Sümer, M. F. Kırzioğlu, etc.) these problems continue to be controversial and there is still disagreement as to the date, authorship, the origin of the existing text, the identity of the heroes and of the place-names, etc. As research stands at present, we can cautiously assume that these stories were collected from oral tradition and put together and polished by an unknown author, probably during the second half of the 9th/15th century. They seem to be mainly based on the reminiscences of the Oghuz Turks concerning their life in their original home in Central Asia. In the present text they relate the life of the Oghuz Turkish tribes in north-eastern Anatolia, the deeds of their prince Bayundur Khan and their chief Salur Kazan Beg, of his wife Burla Khātun, and his son Uruz and their companions, their battles against other Turkish tribes and against the Black Sea Greeks and Georgians. The effect of Islamic culture is superficial. The pre-Islamic elements have strong common characteristics, in expression, style and content, with Anatolian and Central Asian popular literature. Some of the tales (e.g., Beyrek) still live in Turkish folklore in slightly altered versions, and two tales (Depegöz and Deli Dumrul) show striking resemblances to Greek legends (Cyclops and Admetus) (cf. C. S. Mundy, *Polyphemus and Tepegöz*, *BSOAS*, xviii, 1956, 279-302).

Bibliography: Detailed bibliographical data are given in the following works: Orhan Şaik Gökyay, *Dede Korkut*, Istanbul 1938; Ettore Rossi, *Il Kitāb-i Dede Qorqut*, Vatican 1952; P. N. Boratav, *Korkut Ata*, in *IA*; idem, *Dede Korkut hikāyelerindeki tariḥî olaylar ve kitabın telif tarihi*, *TM*, xiii, 1958, 30-62; Muharrem Ergin, *Dede Korkut Kitabı*, i, *Giriş-Metin-Facsimile*, Ankara 1958. For a recent study of the language of the work see E. M. Demircizade, *Kitāb-i Dede Korkud dastanlarının dili*, Baku 1959. A German translation of the text was published by J. Hein, *Das Buch des Dede Korkut*, Zurich 1958.

(FAHİR İZ)

DEDE SULTĀN, epithet of a great religious fanatic by name of Bürklüdje Muşafā, who was prominent in Anatolia in the time of Mehemmed I (further information under BADR AL-DİN B. KĀPİ SAMĀWNĀ). (FR. TAESCHNER)

DEFTER [see DAFTAR].

DEFTER-I KHĀKĀNĪ [see DAFTAR-I KHĀKĀNĪ].

generally larger than the other types such as the *duff*, *mazhar* and *ṭār*, although in the *Kashf al-humūm* we read that tambourines were made in various sizes 'from the large *ṭār* (*ṭār kabīr*) to the small *ghirbāl* (*ghirbāl daḳīk*)'. For the Egyptian instrument see Villoteau (988), and for the Algerian see Christianowitsch (31, pl. 9), Delphin et Guin (37) and Lavignac (2931). In Morocco, according to Höst (261, pl. xxxi, 6), it was called the *dif* (ضيف). Actual specimens may be found at Brussels, Nrs. 308, 309 (Mahillon, i, 393, 400) and at New York, Nr. 452 (Catalogue, iii, 50).

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

5. The round form with jingling rings. This is a similar instrument to the preceding but with jingling rings (*djalādīl*) fixed in the shell or body instead of jingling plates. In Egypt, in the time of Villoteau (i, 988), it was known as the *mazhar*, but in Persia, a century earlier, Kaempfer calls it the *dā'ira* (741, 8).

6. The round form with small bells. This is the same instrument as the preceding in regard to shape but the jingling apparatus, instead of being fixed in spaces in the shell or body, is attached to the inside of the shell or body. These small bells (*adḡirās*), often globular in shape like sonnettes, are sometimes attached to a metal or wooden rod fixed across the inside of the head. This instrument is popular in Persia and Central Asia where it is generally known as the *dā'ira*. An 11th/17th century instrument is shown by Kaempfer (742, 8). For a modern instrument see Lavignac (3076). Apparently *dā'ira* and *duff* became generic names for all types of the tambourine although the former must have been reserved for a round type.

7. The round form with both snares and jingling implements. In the Maghrib this instrument is called the *shakshāk* (Delphin and Guin, 38, 65; Lavignac, 2932, 2944). In some parts, however, this type is called the *ṭabila*. In Egypt, according to Villoteau, it was the *bandayr*.

If the drum (*ṭabl*) sounds the martial note of Islam, as Doughty once said, the tambourine sounds the social note. It is true that in the *djāhiliyya*

the tambourine was in the hands of the matrons and singing-girls (*ḡaynāt*) during the battle, sometimes in company with the reed-pipe (*mizmār*) as with the Jewish tribes (*Aghānī*, ii, 172), but it was also the one outstanding instrument of social life (al-Suyūṭī, *Muzhir*, ii, 236) as many a *ḡadīth* testifies. In artistic music the tambourine has ever been the most important instrument for maintaining the rhythm (*īkā'āt*, *uṣūl*, *ḡurūb*).

The *duff* became the Persian *daff* or *dap*, the Kurdish *dafik*, the Albanian and Bosnian *def*, and the Spanish and Portuguese *adufe*. The *dā'ira* is the Caucasian *dahare*, the Serbian and Albanian *daire*, and the *dārā* of India. The *ṭār* survives in the Polish *tur* and the Swahili *atari*. The tambourine was popularized in Europe by the Moors of Spain and was, for a long time, known as the *tambour de Basque*, the latter region being one of the gateways for the infiltration of Moorish civilization. It fell into desuetude in Europe about the 15th century but was revived again in the 17th century when Europe adopted it as part of the Turkish or Janissary music craze.

Bibliography: Farmer, *History of Arabian music to the xiiith century*, 1929; idem, *Studies in oriental musical instruments*, 1931; Sachs, *Reallexikon der Musikinstrumente*, 1913; Fétis, *Histoire générale de la musique*, 1869-76; Christianowitsch, *Esquisse historique de la musique arabe*, 1863; Delphin and Guin, *Notes sur la poésie et la musique arabes dans le Maghreb algérien*, 1886; Advielle, *La musique chez les Persans en 1885*, 1885; Höst, *Nachrichten von Marokos und Fes*, 1787; Kaempfer, *Amoenitatum exoticarum . . .*, 1712; al-Mufaddal b. Salama, *Kitāb al-Malāhī*, Cairo MS., f. dj. 533; *Kashf al-humūm*, Cairo MS., f. dj. 1; *Aghānī*, Bülāḡ ed.; Mahillon, *Catalogue . . . du Musée Instrumental du Conservatoire Royal de Musique*, 2nd ed.; *Catalogue of the Crosby Brown collection of musical instruments*, New York; Ewliyā Čelebi, *Narrative of Travels . . . by Ewliya Efendi*, tr. J. von Hammer, 1834; Ibn 'Abd Rabbihī, *al-'Iḡd al-farīd*, Cairo 1887-8; *Kitāb al-Imtā' wa 'l-in-tijā'*, Madrid MS., Nr. 603; G. Toderini, *Letteratura turchesca*, Venice 1787; Lavignac, *Encyclopédie de la musique*, v, 1922; Villoteau, in *Description de l'Égypte*, i, (Folio ed.); *Glossarium Latino-Arabicum*, ed. Seybold; Niebuhr, *Voyage en Arabie*, 1776; Fitrat, *Uzbek ḡlassīḡ mūsīḡāst*, Tashkent 1927; Mironov, *Pesni Fergani Bukhari i khivī*, Tashkent 1931; Belaiev, *Musikalnie instrumenti uzbekistana*, Moscow 1933; Kāmil al-Khulā'ī, *Kitāb al-Musīḡī al-sharḡī*, Cairo 1322.

(H. G. FARMER)

DÜGHLĀT, occasionally **DÜKLĀT**, a Mongol tribe whose name, according to Abu 'l-ḡhāzī (ed. Desmaisons, St. Petersburg 1871, i, 65), derives from the plural of the Mongol word *dogholong* (-lang) "lame". The tribe appears to have played no part in the early period of the Mongol Empire, though it is supposed always to have supported Čingiz Khān (Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Berezin in *Trudi vost. otd. Imp. Russk. Arkheol. obshchestva*, vii, 275, xiii/text 47, 52; tr. L. A. Khetagurov, Moscow-Leningrad 1952, i/1, 193). At that time the tribe apparently emigrated in its entirety out of Mongolia; there is at least no Mongol tribe of that name today.

The Dūghlāt did not attain political significance until after the disintegration of the Ilkhān Empire [q.v.], from which time Muḡammad ḡaydar Dūghlāt (ḡaydar Mīrzā, [q.v.]), a member of the tribe, provides information about them in his *Ta'riḡh-i*

Rashīdī (ed. N. Elias and E. Denison Ross, London 1895). But his information is not everywhere reliable and, in the few places where the tribe is mentioned in other sources, contradicts these. According to Ḥaydar a member of the Dūghlāt, Tūlik or perhaps his younger brother Būlādī (the form Pūlādī printed in the edition of Abu M-Ghāzī, 56 ff., does not appear in the manuscripts), is supposed in 748/1347-8 to have placed Khān Tughluq Temür on the throne at Aqsū in the Tarim Basin. The latter in turn is supposed to have expressed his gratitude to the Dūghlāt by granting them "nine powers" and thus to have stabilized their power in the Tarim Basin. Ḥaydar Dūghlāt claims to have seen this document "in the Mongol language and script" in his childhood, but says that it was lost during the reign of Shaybānī Khān, d. 916/1510 [q.v.] (*Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī*, 54 f., 305). But the inaccurate chronology of this historian in the pertinent notices tends to provoke strong doubt as to the genuineness of the document. Between 769/1368 and 794/1392 (?) power in Moghōlistān (as eastern interior Asia starting at about Semiryeč'e was at that time called) was wielded by Kamar al-Dīn Dūghlāt (Sharaf al-Dīn Yazdī, *Zafar-nāma*, ed. Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1887-8, i, 78 ff.), a brother of Būlādī according to the *Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī*. After an early period of co-operation with Timūr [q.v.], he was forced by the latter, after a long struggle, to flee across the Irtiṣh into the Altai (Yazdī, i, 494 ff.). Two of his brothers remained in the service of Timūr (Yazdī, i, 104 ff., 650), whose sister was married to a member of the Dūghlāt.

After 1392 Kamar al-Dīn's nephew (?) Khudāydād, nominally major domo, was in fact the ruler of Moghōlistān. The Čingizid [q.v.] khāns whom he put on the throne were nothing but puppets. Khudāydād demonstrated his readiness to reach a settlement with the Timūrids [q.v.], ostensibly owing to their common Islamic faith, and met in 828/1425 Ulugh Beg [q.v.] without battle in Semiryeč'e ('Abd al-Razzāk Samarkandī, *Maṭla' al-sa'dayn*, Ms. Leningrad, 157, fol. 230). In view of this agreement the khāns of Moghōlistān had to accept the division of their land among the brothers and sons of Khudāydād (*Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* 100). His eldest son Muḥammad Shāh was appointed tribal chief (Ulus Begi) by Khān Wa'is (ca. 1418-29) and took up residence in Semiryeč'e (*Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* 78). His younger son was driven out of the western Tarim Basin by the Timūrids (1416? Samarkandī in *Notices et extraits* xiv, i, 296) and died even before his father did. His son Sayyid 'Alī finally retook Kāshghar and ruled there for 24 years (died 862/1457-8, according to his tomb in Kāshghar; see *Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* 87, 99). He was succeeded by his two sons Sāniz Mīrzā (until 869/1464-5) and Muḥammad Ḥaydar (until 885/1480), both of whom performed great services in the development of the region. Then Abū Bakr Mīrzā, the son of Sāniz, drove his uncle and Khān Yūnus of Moghōlistān out of the western Tarim Basin, after which he took up residence in Yarkend and defended himself in 904-5/1499 against an attack by the khāns of Moghōlistān. Not until 920/1514 was he eliminated by Sa'īd Khān (*Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* 293).

In addition to the principal line other branches of the Dūghlāt repeatedly established small principalities, occasionally at war with the former. Muḥammad Ḥaydar for example, the grandfather of the historian Muḥammad Ḥaydar, fought in alliance with the Čingizid Yūnus and with the Timūrid

Aḥmad Mīrzā against Abū Bakr Mīrzā (see above). His sons Muḥammad Ḥusain and Sayyid Muḥammad Mīrzā vacillated continuously between the two dynasties and were even from time to time in the service of the Uzbeks. The former was finally killed in Herāt at the command of Shaybānī [q.v.] in 914/1508-9. His brother fell victim in 1533 to the hatred of Khān 'Abd al-Rashīd of Moghōlistān, who had come to power in the same year (*Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* 106 ff., 305, 450). Muḥammad Ḥusayn's son, the historian Muḥammad Ḥaydar Mīrzā, left in 1541 his position as governor of Ladakh in the service of the ruler of the Tarim Basin to proclaim his independence in Kashmīr (see ḤAYDAR MĪRZĀ).

With the elimination of this line and the end of Abū Bakr's (see above) rule in 920/1514, the independence of the Dūghlāt in the Tarim Basin came to an end. They continued to support the Čingizids there and wielded considerable power into the 17th century.

A tributary of the "Great Horde" of Kazakhs between the Ili and the Jaxartes bore the name Dulat into the 20th century, obviously derived from Dūghlāt. At the end of the 19th century, they included almost 40,000 tents (see N. Aristov, *Zamētki ob etničeskom sostavē Tyurkskikh plemēn i narodnostey*, St. Petersburg 1897, 77).

Bibliography: the sources are mentioned above. Studies include W. Barthold, *Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, Berlin 1935, 209-14 (French tr. Paris 1945); idem, *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, tr. V. Minorsky, i, 1956, 54; R. Grousset, *L'Empire des steppes*, Paris 1939, index; P. P. Ivanov, *Očerki po istorii Sredney Azii* (Outlines of the history of Central Asia), Moscow 1958, i and ii; B. Spuler, in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, volume v, 5, index. The last two works named contain further detailed bibliography.

(W. BARTHOLD-[B. SPULER])

DUḤĀ (AR.), "forenoon", the hour of one of the prayers [see ṢALĀT].

DUKAYN AL-RĀDJIZ, the name of two poets who were confused by Ibn Kutayba (*Shi'r*, Shākir ed. 592-95) and the authors who copied or utilized him: Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, *ʿIkd*, 1346/1928 ed., 202-3; *Aghānī*, viii, 155—Beirut ed., ix, 252-3; C. A. Nallino, *Litt.*, (with a note of correction by M. Nallino).

1. — Dukayn b. Radjā' al-Fuḳaymī (d. 105/723-24); a panegyric in *radjaz* composed by him on Muṣ'ab b. al-Zubayr, and an *urdjūza* upon his horse who won a race organized by al-Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik (see Yākūt, xi, 113-17; Ibn 'Asākir, v, 274-9), have been preserved.

2. — Dukayn b. Sa'īd al-Dārimī (d. 109/727-28) to whom Ibn Kutayba actually dedicated his article entitled Dukayn al-Rādijiz; see also Ibn 'Asākir, *ibid.*; Yākūt, xi, 117-19. He wrote a panegyric on 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz when the latter was made governor of Medina (87/706), which brought him a rich present, formal promises and perhaps the intimacy of 'Umar. After the latter had risen to the Caliphate (99/717), Dukayn went to visit him, reminded him of their covenant and received a new gift. This Dukayn is said to have written the line: "When a man has not sullied his honour with vile deeds, whatever garment he wears is fine", which appears, however, at the beginning of the famous *Lāmiyya* by al-Samaw'al (F. Bustānī, *al-Madjanī al-ḥadītha*, i, 345).

This poet should not be confused with Dukayn

(intact or reduced to a single hemistich); (b) in lexicography, the *afrād* are the words handed down by one single lexicographer (see al-Suyūṭī, *Muzhir*³, i, ch. 5), distinct from *āhād* (*ibid.*, i, 114; lines 8-12) and *mafārīd* (*ibid.*, ch. 15); (c) in grammar, *al-fard* has been said to signify "the singular" by de Sacy (*Gr. Ar.*², i, 149), Fleischer (*Kleinere Schriften*, i, 97), Wright (*Ar. Gr.*³, i, 52B). This can only be a recent or exceptional meaning of the word, which should be dropped and replaced by the traditional terms *al-wāhid* or (more often used today) *al-mufrad*; (d) in the science of *hadīth*, *fard* is synonymous with *gharīb mutlaq*: a tradition in which the second link of the chain of those who have transmitted it is only represented by a single *tābi'i*; (e) in astronomy, *al-fard* denotes the star *alpha* in Hydra (*al-shudjā'*), and hence the most brilliant (idea of isolation); (f) in arithmetic, *al-'adad al-fard* is "the odd number" (from 3 upwards, inclusive), as opposed to *al-'adad al-zawdj* "even number" (al-Kh^wārizmī, *Mafātīh al-'ulūm*, ed. van Vloten, 184), other uses of *fard* in the divisibility of numbers, *ibid.*, 184-5; (g) for theologians and philosophers, *al-fard* denotes the species, as restricted by the bond of individuation.

Bibliography: in the text; see also Tahānawī, *Dictionary of technical terms*, ii, 1087, 1107, 1178 foot and 1179; Lane, *Lexicon*, s.v.

(H. FLEISCH)

AL-FARD [see NUDJŪM]

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

Bibliography: Tahānawī, *Dictionary of technical terms*, 1124-6, 1444-8; N. P. Aghnides, *Mohammedan theories of finance*, New York 1916, 112 ff.; Santillana, *Istituzioni*, i, 57 ff. See also FURDA.

(TH. W. JUYNBOLL*)

FARGHĀNĀ, Ferghānā, a valley on the middle Jaxartes (Sīr-Daryā), approximately 300 km. long and 70 km. wide, surrounded by parts of the Tianshan mountains: the Čatkal range (Ar. *Djadghal*, up to 3,000 m. high) on the north, the Ferghānā mountains (up to 4,000 m.) on the east, and the Alai mountains (up to 6,000 m.) on the south. The only approach (7 km. wide) accessible in all seasons is in the west, at the point where the Jaxartes leaves the valley and where the trade-route (and since 1899 the railway from Samarkand to Ōsh) enters it. The Ferghānā valley covers approximately 23,000 km.²; the irrigated land (9,000 km.²) has increased during the last decades, owing to the constant extension of irrigation. The interior of the area consists of a desert.

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

Evidently Ferghānā became known to the Chinese in 128 B.C., from the description of an envoy who had travelled through it. But the connexion of the Chinese accounts with individual areas or persons cannot be established with any certainty. After the spread of the second (western) Kōk-Turkish kingdom Ferghānā was exposed to Turkish attacks and, after continued fighting between 627 and 649 A.D., came under Turkish dominion. A Turkish prince took up residence in Kāsān (Chinese K'ō-sai), the capital of that time. After the overthrow of the first west-Turkish kingdom by the Chinese, in 657, the whole district was governed from Kāsān by a Chinese governor. The indigenous Iranian dynasty, whose influence had for some time been weakened by a succession of local princes (as reported by the Chinese envoy Hūan-tsang in 630), was evidently supplanted by a Turkish ruling family, after the elimination of Chinese rule in about 680. In 739 Arslan Khān is mentioned as ruler of Ferghānā.

An Arab-Muslim advance into Ferghānā, alleged to have taken place in the time of the Caliph 'Uthmān under the leadership of Muḥammad b. Djarīr, who is said to have fallen at Saḥīd Bulān at the head of 2700 warriors (according to *Djamāl Karshī* apud Barthold, *Turkestan*, 160), certainly belongs to the realm of legend. The legend formed the basis for a Persian folk-tale (said to have been translated from Arabic) which later spread throughout Central Asia, and was finally translated into Turkish (cf. *Protokoli Turkest. Kruška Lyubiteley Arkheologii*, iv, 149 f.).

In fact the Muslim invasion of Ferghānā is connected with the occupation of Transoxania by Kutayba b. Muslim [q.v.]. He first advanced into the country in 94/712-3 and attempted a revolt from there against the Caliph in 96/715, but was killed by his own soldiers (Ṭabarī, ii, 1256 f., 1275-81; S. G. Klyashtorniy, *Iz istorii bor'bi narodov Sredney Azii protiv arabov* [Remarks on the history of the struggle of the peoples of Central Asia against the Arabs], in *Ėpigrāfika Vostoka*, ix (1954), 55-64: this treats mainly of the events of 712). Kutayba's grave is still pointed out today close to the village of Djalāl Kuduk, near Andījān (*Protokoli*, iii, 4). This revolt and the battles which followed in Persia in the next decades, finally leading to the downfall of the Umayyads in 749-50, prevented for some time the consolidation of Arab-Islamic rule over Ferghānā. The Muslims apparently had to leave the country again and in 103/721-2 the indigenous Sogdian prince was able to recall and resettle in part of his country those Sogdians who had migrated further eastwards to avoid the summons to adopt Islam (Spuler, *Iran*, 37, 254 f.). At that time the local nobility (gentry: *Dihkāns* [q.v.]) played the leading rôle in Ferghānā, as in the rest of Transoxania. The local prince also bore this title beside that of *Ikhshēdh* (cf. *IKHSHĪDIDS*, and Ol'ga I. Smirnova, *Sogdiyskie moneti kak noviy istočnik dlya istorii Sredney Azii* [Sogdian coins as a

new source for the history of Central Asia], in *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, vi (1949), 356-67; further, A. Yu Yakubovskiy [ed.]: *Trudī sogdiysko-ladzhikskoy ekspeditsii . . .* [Works of the Sogdian-Tadjik expedition . . .], i, Moscow-Leningrad 1950, 224-31; further as sources: al-Balādhurī, *Futūh*, 420; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1442, 2142; *Hudūd al-ʿālam*, ed. Minorsky, 115-17, 355; idem in *BSOAS*, xvii/2 (1955), 265.—In the year 121/739 the Arabs were once more able to send a governor to Farghānā (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1694), but there was still continued opposition to Islam, especially as the permanence of Arab rule had again been put in doubt by the advance of Chinese armies into Western Central Asia as far as Transoxania, between 745 and 751 (cf. Spuler, *Iran*, 302 and the sources and studies given there). An envoy sent to the Caliph al-Manṣūr by the local prince, who had evidently fled to Kāshghar, was held prisoner for a long time owing to his refusal to adopt Islam (Yaʿqūbī, ii, 645). The Caliphs al-Mahdī, Hārūn al-Raṣhīd (175-6/791-3) and al-Maʿmūn were also forced to send troops to Farghānā to overcome the opposition to Islam and Arab rule (Yaʿqūbī, ii, 465 f., 478; Gardēzī, 19; further Spuler, *Iran*, 51 f.). Only the inclusion of Farghānā in the dominions of the Sāmānids [q.v.] in approximately 205/820-1, under the administration of the governor Nūḥ b. Asad (d. 227/841-2), opened the last doors to Islam, both in Kāsān (al-Yaʿqūbī, *Geogr.*, 294, al-Yaʿqūbī, ii, 478; al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1257), the centre of administration, and Ūrast. The indigenous dynasty had in the meantime disappeared. From then on, the inhabitants of Farghānā supplied soldiers for the guards of the Caliph al-Muʿtaṣim (218-27/833-42: al-Balādhurī, 431; Spuler, *Iran*, 137, 185, fn. 8). They thereby strengthened the influence of the Iranian element in Mesopotamia, which moreover increased continually under the Sāmānids.

Farghānā in the time of the Sāmānids has been amply described by Arab geographers. At that time a change in the economic importance of the several parts of the country appears to have taken place. According to Ibn Khurradādhbih, 30, the road leading into the country from the west crossed the Jaxartes at Khodjand ([q.v.]; now Leninābād), and continued to Akhsīkāth [q.v.], along the right bank, then to Kubā, Ūsh and Ōzkānd (Ūzgand) along the left bank. Al-Iṣṭakhrī, 335, on the other hand considers the road running south of the river to be the main one and lists several populated places along it; only a secondary road led to Akhsīkāth at that time. The Farghānā valley then formed the frontier district against the (still unconverted) Turks, who had recently been driven back north-eastwards in several places. There were strong garrisons in Ūsh and some neighbouring forts, used as observation posts against them. Akhsīkāth (al-Iṣṭakhrī, 333) was the capital at that time, a position it held as early as the middle of the seventh century, according to Chinese reports and al-Balādhurī (*Futūh*, ed. de Goeje, 420). On the other hand Kubā is designated as larger, and as the actual capital of the country by al-Muḳaddasī, 272, though its period of prosperity was certainly short.—In the tenth century Farghānā was divided into three provinces and many administrative districts, which are listed by the geographers. They stress the fact that the villages of the country were bigger than elsewhere in Transoxania and occasionally extended as much as a day's journey. Islam (of the Ḥanafī school of law) had asserted itself successfully in the meantime, and convents (*Khānqāh*) of the Karrāmiyya [q.v.] are also mentioned by al-Muḳaddasī, 323. Nothing else is reported about

adherents of other religions, such as Christians, Manichaeans and Zoroastrians. Nevertheless an Arabic inscription dating from 433/1041-2 was discovered in the gorge at Wārūkh (in the south), showing a Sassanian and Christian (*rūmī*) date beside the Muslim one (*Protokoll*, viii, 46 f.). A further Arabic inscription (without this peculiarity in the dating) from the year 329/940-1 was found in Ūsh in 1885 (*Oltēt Imp. Arkheol. Kommissii za 1882-1888 godī*, p. LXXIII). Buildings from Sāmānid times, on the other hand, have evidently not been preserved.

The mountain ranges surrounding the valley supplied gold, silver and coal (already then used for heating, al-Iṣṭakhrī, 334), and furthermore petroleum, iron, copper, lead, turquoises, sal ammoniac and a medicament called Kūfīkān (cf. *BGA*, iv, 344; particulars in Spuler, *Iran*, 387, 389, 399, with sources, especially al-Muḳaddasī, 326; Ibn Ḥawḳal², 384). Turkish slaves, iron and copper, swords and armour as well as textiles were exported from Farghānā and Isfīdjāb (*Hudūd al-ʿālam*, 116; Spuler, *Iran*, 407 f.). Judging by the growth in revenue the country's prosperity increased greatly in Sāmānid times. According to Ibn Khurradādhbih, 38, it amounted to 280,000 dirhems; Ibn Ḥawḳal², 470, writing about 130 years later, in 977, puts it already at one million (Spuler, *Iran*, 476).

After the collapse of the Sāmānid state in 389/999, Farghānā came under the dominion of the Karluḳs [q.v.] and thus of the ruling dynasty of the Iiig-Khāns or Karakhānids [q.v.]. Ōzkānd [q.v.], where twelfth-century buildings and tomb-stones are still preserved, now became the centre of administration. It was there that most coins were minted (often bearing the province name Farghānā as the place of coinage), but other minting-places also occur. The whole of Transoxania was originally administered from Ōzkānd. After the divisions which soon took place within the Karakhānid dynasty (cf. O. Pritsak, in *Isl.*, xxxi/1 (1953), 17-68), the princes of Farghānā settled in Ōzkānd, where they withstood a Salḳūḳ advance in the years 482-3/1089-90. In 536/1141 Farghānā came under the dominion of the Gūrkhāns [q.v.] of the Karakhitāy [q.v.], but the indigenous dynasty was still tolerated, as elsewhere within this state. Until 560-74/1165-79, this dynasty seems also to have ruled over Samarkand, which later again came under the rule of a separate branch of the Karakhānids. From 1212 to 1218 Farghānā was disputed between the Khārizmshāh Muḥammad II [q.v.] and first the Nayman prince Küčlūg, who had fled westwards, then the Mongols; with the subjection of the prince of Akhsīkāth and Kāsān, the province subsequently fell to the Mongols (Ulus of Čaghatāy; cf. the article ČINGIZIDS, above) for whom it was long administered by Maḥmūd and his son Masʿūd Yalavač in the thirteenth century. Local princes in Farghānā were tolerated for a long time; the sheltered position of the valley induced Baraḳ Khān, the Mongol governor, and the Karakhitāy before him, to keep the treasury there (Waṣṣāf, Bombay ed., 67 bottom; Djuwaynī, i, 48). The newly founded town of Andīdjān [q.v.] (known to the Arab geographers only as the village Anduḳān) was the capital of the Farghānā valley at the end of the thirteenth century. Marghinān now also gained in importance.

After the Ulus of Čaghatāy split into two opposing sections in the fourteenth century, both the western kingdom (Transoxania) and the eastern kingdom (then called Moghōlistān) contended for Farghānā

at different times, up to the time of Timūr. As Farghānā belonged to Moghōlistān during the greater part of this struggle, its administration shared certain aspects of the administration of the Tarim valley: the tax districts in both countries were called Urċin, not Tūmān (Mongolian *tlmen*: unit of ten thousand) as in the rest of Transoxania.

Under the Timūrids [*q.v.*] Farghānā mostly belonged to Khurāsān (*i.e.*, to the dominion of Shāhrukh [*q.v.*] and his son Ulugh Beg [*q.v.*]) and from 873-99/1469-94 had its own ruler in 'Umar Shaykh [*q.v.*], a great-great-grandson of Timūr. He was succeeded by his son Bābur, who from Farghānā moved against the intruding Shaybānids [*q.v.*] and advanced as far as Samarqand; but in 909/1504, after eventful battles he saw himself forced to surrender Farghānā, and finally fled altogether to India (for details see BĀBUR). It is to him that we owe a more exact description of Farghānā at a time when power-relationships in Central Asia were undergoing a decisive change, through the fall of the Timūrids, the advance of the Shaybānids at the head of the Özbegs [*q.v.*], as well as the establishment of the Shī'ī Šafavids [*q.v.*] in Persia. At that time there were nine larger towns in Farghānā, to which Bābur also adds Khodjand. Khoqand, the later capital, was only a village at the time. The capital was Andijān, which was already completely turkicized. (According to Bābur, it was here that Čaghatay, raised to a literary language by 'Alī Shīr Nawā'ī, was spoken). Marghinān was then still Iranian.—At the time of Bābur there were numerous orchards and gardens in Farghānā and various kinds of wood used for making quivers, bird-cages and similar articles; also a reddish-white stone, discovered in about 1492 and used for making knife-handles and articles of that kind. Iron and turquoise were obtained from the mines; but Bābur makes no mention of coal-mining or the manufacture of weapons, two formerly important branches of the economy. According to his estimate the country was only sufficiently rich to support an army of 3-4000 men.

After the final expulsion of the Timūrids, Farghānā belonged to the Özbek state of the Shaybānids; Andijān was then the seat of a local dynasty and gave its name to the whole valley (cf. Maḥmūd ibn Walī, *Baḥr al-asrār*, MS India Office 575, fol. 102b). After the collapse of the Shaybānid state in 1598-9, several Khodja families divided the country up among themselves. They lived under the nominal dependency of Bukhārā, in Čadak, north of the Jaxartes, and had to submit to a number of arrangements with the Kazakhs and Kirgiz, who repeatedly pressed into the valleys of the mountains surrounding Farghānā. In 1121/1709-10 the Farghānā valley became a separate Özbek Khānate under Shāhrukh Bī (Mullā Niyāz Muḥammad, *Ta'riḫ-i Shāhrukhī*, ed. N. N. Pantusov, Kazan 1885, 21; cf. Ivanov, 178-214). From then until 1876 the Farghānā valley was the centre of the Khānate of Khoqand (*q.v.* for details about the name and history of the town).

In 1876 the Khānate was annexed by the Russians and became the centre of the "Farghānā district" (Ferganskaya Oblast'), an area of 160,141 km.² (according to Brockhaus-Efron) with 1,560,411 inhabitants (in 1897). The seat of the military government was the town New Margelan, founded by the Russians, called Skobelev from 1907-24, and subsequently Farghānā (pop., 1951, approx. 50,000) and still today the centre of administration of the "Farghānā district" in Uzbekistan (8029 km.² with approximately 720,000 inhabitants [in 1951]). The

towns of Khoqand and Namangān were, however, considerably larger and of greater economic importance (Khoqand had approximately 113,000 inhabitants in 1912, and Namangān 70,000; in 1951, in contrast, approximately 93,000 and 115,000 respectively).

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

Bibliography: Chinese and Köktürks: Edouard Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*, St. Petersburg 1903, especially 148 ff.; Hsüan-Tschuang (Hiouen-Tshang), *Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales*, ed. Stanislas Julien, 2 vols., Paris 1857-8; Yu. A. Zadneprovskiy, *Drevnezemledel'českaya kul'tura Fergani (The ancient agrarian culture of Farghānā)*, Moscow and Leningrad 1962 (*Materiali i issledovaniya po arkheologii SSSR*, cxviii).

Islamic period: Barthold, *Turkestan*, 155-65, 186-202 and index; idem, *Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken: Mittelasiens*, Berlin 1935; idem, *Four Studies*, ed. V. Minorsky, i, Leiden 1956; Bertold Spuler, *Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1952, index; P. P. Ivanov, *Očerki po istorii Sredney Azii [Sketches in the history of Central Asia]*, Moscow 1958, *passim*, especially 178-213.

Geography: Le Strange, 476-80; A. von Middendorff, *Einblicke in das Farghānā-Tal*, St. Petersburg 1881 (*Mém. de l'Acad.*, vol. xxix); W. Busse, *Bewässerungswirtschaft in Turan*, 1915; W. Leimbach, *Die Sowjetunion*, Stuttgart 1950, 42 ff., 147, 526; Th. Shabad, *Geography of the USSR*, New York 1951, 388-99 and index; V. Masal'skiy in Brockhaus-Efron, *Éntsiklopedičeskii Slovar'* xxxv A (70), St. Petersburg 1902, 560-4; *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Éntsiklopediya*², xlv (1956), 617-20 (both articles are geographical-statistical).

Maps: 7th cent.: A. Herrmann, *Atlas of China*, Cambridge Mass. 1935, 37; 10th cent.: Spuler, *op. cit.*, end; modern: *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Éntsi-*

*klopediya*², xlv, facing p. 618 (with illus.); Diercke, *Weltatlas*, 91st ed., 1957, p. 93; Leimbach, 340; Shabad, 395. (W. BARTHOLD-[B. SPULER])

AL-FARGHĀNĪ, the mediaeval astronomer *Alfraganus*. His full name is Abu 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Kathīr al-Farghānī, that is to say, a native of Farghāna in Transoxania; not everyone, however, is agreed upon his name: the *Fihrist* only speaks of Muḥammad b. Kathīr, and Abu 'l-Faradj of Aḥmad b. Kathīr, while Ibn al-Kifṭī distinguishes between two persons, Muḥammad and Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, in other words father and son; however it is very probable that all the references are to the same personage, an astronomer who lived in the time of the Caliph al-Ma'mūn (d. 833) and until the death of al-Mutawakkil (861), for Abu 'l-Maḥāsīn and Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a refer to a certain Aḥmad b. Kathīr al-Farghānī who, in 247/861, is said to have been sent by al-Mutawakkil to Fustāṭ to supervise the construction of a Nilometer.

His principal work, which still survives in Arabic at Oxford, Paris, Cairo and the library of Princeton University, bears different titles: *Djawāmi' 'ilm al-nudjūm wa 'l-ḥarakāt al-samāwiyya*, *Uṣūl 'ilm al-nudjūm*, *al-Madkhal ila 'ilm hay'at al-aflāk*, and *Kitāb al-ḥuṣūl al-ṭhalāthin*. It was translated into Latin by John of Seville and Gerard of Cremona. According to Steinschneider, a translation into Hebrew by Jacob Anatoli also exists at Berlin, Munich, Vienna, Oxford, etc. The Latin translation by John of Seville was printed at Ferrara in 1493, Nuremberg in 1537, Paris in 1546, Berkeley (F. J. Carmody) in 1943; the translation by Gerard of Cremona was published by R. Campani (Città di Castello, 1910). From Jacob Anatoli's translation into Hebrew Jacob Christmann made a Latin translation which appeared in 1590 at Frankfurt-am-Main. In 1669, at Amsterdam, Jacob Golius edited the Arabic text with a translation and a copious commentary, under the title: *Muhammedis fil. Ketiri Ferganensis, qui vulgo Alfraganus dicitur, Elementa astronomica, Arabice et Latine*. Apart from this work which, before Regiomontanus, was more widely circulated in the west than that of any other Arabic astronomer, since it was fairly short and easily understood, al-Farghānī also wrote two books on the astrolabe, *al-Kāmil fi 'l-aṣṭurlāb* and *Fī ṣan'at al-aṣṭurlāb* (the Arabic text of which is extant in Berlin and Paris) and certain other works, references to which are given in Brockelmann and Carmody.

Bibliography: *Fihrist*, i, 279; Ibn al-Kifṭī, ed. Lippert, 78 and 286; Abu 'l-Faradj (ed. Ṣāḥnānī), 236; Ibn Abī Uṣaybi'a, i, 207; Ibn Taghribirdī, i, 742; M. Steinschneider, *Die europäischen Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen bis Mitte des XVII Jahr.*, SBAk. Wien, phil.-hist. Klasse, cxlix, 22 and 44; Brockelmann, I, 221 SI, 392-3; Suter, *Abhandlungen zur Gesch. der mathem. Wissensch.*, x, 18 and xiv, 160; Sarton, *Introduction*, i, 567; P. Duhem, *Système du monde*, ii, 204-14; F. J. Carmody, *Arabic astronomical and astrological sciences in Latin translation*, Berkeley 1956, 113-6. (H. SUTER-[J. VERNET])

AL-FARGHĀNĪ, the name of two tenth-century historians, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Dja'far (b. 282/895-6, d. 362/972-3) and his son, Abū Maṣṣūr Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh (327/939-398/1007). 'Abd Allāh's great-grandfather had been brought to the 'Irāk from Farghāna and had become a Muslim under al-Mu'taṣim. 'Abd Allāh himself was a student of the great Ṭabarī, whose works he transmitted, and he achieved high rank in the army.

He went to Egypt where his son, it seems, was born, and he and his family remained there. He wrote a continuation of al-Ṭabarī's historical work, entitled *al-Ṣila* or *al-Mudhāyyal*, and his son wrote a further continuation, entitled *Ṣilat al-Ṣila*. Both works are known only from quotations in the works of other historians, though it has been suggested that a papyrus leaf containing the account of a battle from the reign of al-Muqtadir may derive from the *Ṣila*; they were probably much more widely used than citations under their names indicate. The younger Farghānī also wrote biographies of Kāfūr al-Iḫshīdī and the Fāṭimid al-'Azīz, both of which, unfortunately, have been lost along with most of the historical literature written under the Fāṭimids.

Bibliography: *Ta'rikh Baghdād*, ix, 389; *Ta'rikh Dimashk*, vii, 277; Yāqūt, *Udabā'*, i, 161 f.; Ṣafadī, *Wāfi*, under Aḥmad (who follows Yāqūt); intro. to Ṭabarī, xx; R. Guest, in *A volume of Oriental studies presented to E. G. Browne*, Cambridge 1922, 173; F. Rosenthal, *A history of Muslim historiography*, Leiden 1952, 73; N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic literary papyri*, i, Chicago 1957, 109 ff. (F. ROSENTHAL)

FARHĀD PASHA [see FERHĀD PASHA].

FARHĀD WA-SHĪRĪN. A. Christensen (*Sassanides*, 469 and index) has collected together the information relating to Shīrīn (Pehlavi *Shirēn* "the sweet"; cf. Γλυκέρα, Glycera), a Christian favourite of the Sāsānid king of Irān, Khusraw II Parvīz (Pehlavi *Abharvēr* "the victorious", 590-628). According to Sebeos, she was a native of Khuzistān; Khusraw married her at the beginning of his reign and she maintained her influence over him although inferior in status to Maria the Byzantine whom he had married mainly for reasons of policy; she protected the Christian clergy, probably lived for a time in the palace, the ruins of which still survive at Kaṣr-i Shīrīn [q.v.], and she did not forsake the king in the last hours immediately before his assassination; their son, Mardānshāh, was put to death when Shēroē, Maria's son, overthrew him and ascended the throne. Legends concerning the love of the king and Shīrīn soon came into being, and some of the details were collected by al-Tha'ālibī (691) and Firdawsī (*Shāh-nāma*, trans. Mohl, vii), in particular Shīrīn's suicide over the body of Khusraw; this romantic episode, together with that of Shīrīn and Farhād (Pehlavi *Frahād*), became the subject of a series of romances in verse, in Persian, Turkish (see below) and Kurdish (Duda, 3, n. 7 and 8). Moreover Christensen (*Gestes*, 116-9) has noted certain features in the *Persica* of Ctesias in which he sees elements which helped to form the legend of Farhād and Shīrīn—Semiramis creating a garden near Mount Bagistanon (Bisutūn), having a way cut through the Zagros mountains to allow for the passage of a canal, and having a royal castle built for her own use.

After the occupation of Irān by the Arabs, the first text in their language to mention Shīrīn and her lovers is the Chronicle of al-Ṭabarī; in its Persian adaptation by Bal'amī, we read: "Shīrīn was loved by Farhād whom Parvīz punished by sending him to the quarries of Bisutūn" (trans. Zotenberg, ii, 304 and index, s.v. Ferhād, Shīrīn). The Arab geographers mention them; thus Yāqūt claims to see Shīrīn's image among the sculptures of Ṭāk-i Būstān, according to poems which he quotes (*Buldān*, iii, 252-3) and records a narrative (iv, 112; and Barbier de Meynard, *Dictionnaire de la Perse*, 347-8 and 448-9) explaining how the king had a castle

introd., 20. The important thing is that he gave new life to an original which otherwise would no doubt have disappeared like so many other Pahlavi texts.

In his poem the influence of ancient Iran appears particularly in the frequent allusions to the divine or the evil powers, to the sacred fires (mentioned by their names) and to their maintenance, to the ancient months and feast days, and to legendary features; there is in it a case of trial by ordeal, and one of those consanguineous marriages which were characteristic of the royal families of ancient Iran. The subject of the poem is fatal love: from the time of the appearance of the first edition of the Persian text the similarities between the poem and the story of Tristan and Iseult were recognized—there is thus no need to give an analysis of it here (cf. Massé, 9 ff.). The romance may be based on a historical fact: V. Minorsky has sought to demonstrate that it probably relates the adventures of a descendant of the Arsacid family and of a princess of one of the seven noble families of the Parthian period.

In Gurgānī's poetry there are realistic features contributing to knowledge of customs and folklore. At times his style is affected and precious (tr., 20-1), especially when, like other Persian poets, he is describing feminine beauty in conventional terms (e.g., ch. 37; tr., 90). Maḥdjūb has noted a series of images and of ancient proverbs (introd., 55-8), archaism sometimes used with a special meaning (*ibid.*, 34) and some words which are close to the Pahlavi forms (*ibid.*, 43). The poem had a lasting influence. Maḥdjūb points out similarities between some verses of Gurgānī and those of later poets, and even some borrowings (introd., 98 ff.). The ten passionate letters written by Wis to Rāmīn (Minovi, 347-83; Maḥdjūb, 259-86; tr. 318-51) were imitated by the poets Awḥadī, Ibn 'Imād, 'Arifī, 'Imād Faḥīh (ten letters), Amīr Ḥusaynī, Kātībī and Salmān-i Sāwidjī (thirty letters). Of more significance is the similarity evident in the plan of Niẓāmī's verse romance *Khusraw u Shirīn*, which was probably inspired by Gurgānī, though as regards style it may be suggested that Niẓāmī intended that his learned and highly artificial style should form a contrast to the generally simple and sober style of Gurgānī.

Bibliography: Editions: Nassau Lees and Munshi Ahmad Ali (Bibl. Ind.), Calcutta 1864, based on a manuscript in India; Minovi, Tehrān 1314/1935, based on three manuscripts including that of the Bibl. Nat., Paris, which is the best; Muḥammad Dja'far Maḥdjūb, Tehrān 1337/1959, which makes use of the two preceding editions. French translation with introduction, by H. Massé, Paris 1959; Georgian adaptation: *Visramiani*, tr. O. Wardrop (Oriental Translation Fund, new series, xxiii, London 1914). Studies: Z. Safa, *Ta'rikh-i adabiyāt dar Irān*, Tehrān 1336/1958, ii, index; *Gr.I.Ph.*, index; K. H. Graf, analysis and extracts translated into German verse, in *ZDMG*, xxiii (1869), 375-433; Fr. Gabrieli, *Note sul Wis u Rāmīn*, in *R. Acad. Naz. dei Lincei, rendiconti*, March-April 1939; V. Minorsky, *Wis u Rāmīn, a Parthian romance*, in *BSOAS*, xi/4 (1946); Šādīk Hidāyat, in *Payām-i naw*, Tehrān 1324/1946, nos. 1 and 2; M. Minovi, in *Sukhan*, Tehrān 1333-4/1956, nos. 1 and 2; A. Bausani, *Storia della letteratura persiana*, Milan 1960, 621-6; J. Rypka, *Iranische Literaturgeschichte*, Leipzig 1959, 176-8. (H. MASSÉ)

GURGĀNĪ [see DJURDJĀNĪ].

GŪRKHĀN, the title borne by the (non-Muslim) rulers of *Ḳarakhitāy* [q.v.] (Chinese Hsi Liao =

Western Liao) who governed central Asia between 522-5/1128-31 and 608/1212 (or, with Gūčlūk, till 615/1218). The first ruler was Yeh-lü Ta-shih (d. 537/1143), a prince from the north Chinese dynasty of Liao, of the K'ī-tan (*Khītāy*) people. He overthrew the regime of the *Ḳarakhānids* [q.v.] or *Ilig-khāns* and in 535/1141 defeated the *Saldjūkid* sultan Sandjar [q.v.] decisively in the *Ḳaṭwān* plain, north of *Samar-Ḳand*: the victory of a non-Muslim ruler from the East over one of the most powerful rulers of Islam probably provided the foundation for the legend of Prester John [q.v.] (*Gūrkhān* > Johannes).

The title *Gūrkhān* is probably taken from the Turkish words *kür/gür* (Mongol *kür*) ("broad", "wide", "general": cf. Maḥmūd al-*Kāshgharī*, *Diwān*, ed. C. Brockelmann, Budapest 1928, 117; Radloff, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches . . .*,² 1960, ii, 1447, 1637; *Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an (Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen)*, ed. E. Haenisch, Leipzig 1937, 65 and ed. Kozin, Moscow/Leningrad 1941, 278); P. Doerfer in *OLZ*, 1960, col. 635 f. The Muslims also refer to *Gūrkhān* as "*Khān-i Khānān*".

Bibliography: K. A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-Shêng, *History of the Chinese Society Liao*, Philadelphia 1949, 431, 619-55 (History of the *Gūrkhāns* based on Eastern and Western sources, written in collaboration with K. H. Menges); K. Menges in *Byzantion*, xxi/1 (1951), 104-6; idem, in *RO*, xvii (1953), 71; Spuler, *Iran*, 360 n. 8. For the history of the *Gūrkhāns* see also the *Bibl. to ḲARA KHITĀY and KIRMĀN (13th century)*. (B. SPULER)

GUWĀKHARZ [see BĀKHARZ].

GŪZEL HIŞĀR [see AYDĪN].

GŪZGĀN [see DJUZDJĀN].

GWĀLIYĀR, formerly capital of the *Sindhia* state of *Gwāliyār*, now a town in *Madhya Pradesh*. "Tradition assigns the foundation of the city to one *Sūrāj Sen* who was cured of leprosy by an ascetic named *Gwālipa*. The latter inhabited the hill on which the fort now stands, and this was called *Gwāliyār* after him". The early history of *Gwāliyār* is, however, shrouded in myth and romance. The *Hūna* adventurers, *Toramana* and his son *Mihirkula*, who partially overthrew the *Gupta* power in the 6th century A.D., are considered to be the first historical holders of this place. Later *Rādjā Bhodj* of *Kanawdj*, the *Kaḥwāha Rādjpūts* and the *Parihars* respectively held sway over it.

In 413/1022 when Sultan *Maḥmūd* of *Ghazna* marched against *Ganda*, the ruler of *Kāliṅdjār*, he passed the fort of *Gwāliyār*. Since the *Rādjā* of *Gwāliyār* was a feudatory of *Ganda*, the Sultan stormed the fort. The *Rādjā*, despite his successful resistance, was so alarmed that he sued for peace (*Zayn al-akhbār*, 79). In 592/1196 *Ḳuṭb al-Dīn Aybak* took the fort from the *Parihars* (*Ṭabaḳāt-i Nāṣirī*, 145; Eng. tr., Raverty, i, 545-6, with note on other versions). *Iletmish*'s first territorial appointment was as the *amir* of *Gwāliyār* (*Ṭabaḳāt-i Nāṣirī*, 169; Eng. tr. i, 604). It appears to have been lost to the Turks because in 629/1231 *Iletmish* is reported to have reconquered it and made appointments of the *amir-i dād*, the *koḥwāl* and the *ḳādī*. But the history of the Muslim occupation of *Gwāliyār* is a chequered one. Early in her reign *Rādīyya* (634-7/1236-40) had to send an expedition towards *Gwāliyār* under *Tamur Khān*, but the position became untenable and the fort had to be abandoned to *Čahardeva*. In 649/1251 *Balban* led a full-scale expedition against *Gwāliyār*, but does not seem to have achieved any permanent success, for the numismatic evidence shows that