

# THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF  
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

B. LEWIS, V. L. MÉNAGE, CH. PELLAT AND † J. SCHACHT

ASSISTED BY C. DUMONT, SECRETARY GENERAL, AND E. VAN DONZEL AND  
G. R. HAWTING, EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME III

H—IRAM

PHOTOMECHANICAL REPRINT



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL

1986

LONDON  
LUZAC & CO.

Uzbek; Faruk Sümer, *IA*, s.vv. *Pehlivan* and *Kızıl-Arslan*; Zambaur, *Manuel*, 231; Bosworth, *The Islamic dynasties*, 125-6.

For the cultural and literary history of the dynasty, see the references in Dawlatshāh, *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā'*, and 'Awfi, *Lubāb al-albāb*; and also, J. Rypka, *Iranische Literaturgeschichte*, 200 ff., and Browne, ii, 401-2, 412-17.

(C. E. BOSWORTH)

**ILDJĀ'** or **TALDJI'**, a method of protection by a superior of his inferiors, on which see the articles **DAY'A** and **HIMĀVA**, adding to the bibliography Y. Linant de Bellefonds, *Volonté interne et volonté déclarée en droit musulman*, in *Revue Intern. de Droit Comparé*, x (1958), 513 (*taldji'a* occurring in law as a fictitious sale with the object of gaining protection against confiscation, taxes, etc.; but the question arises of how the property is to be regained once the danger is over).

(CL. CAHEN)

**ILEK-KHĀNS** or **KARAKHĀNIDS**, a Turkish dynasty which ruled in the lands of Central Asia straddling the T'ien-shan Mountains, *scil.* in both Western Turkestan (Transoxania or *Mā warā' al-Nahr*) and in Eastern Turkestan (*Kāshgharia* or *Sin-kiang*), from the 4th/10th to the early 7th/13th centuries.

1. Introductory. The name "Ilek-Khāns" or "Ilig-Khāns" stems from 19th century European numismatists. The element *Ilek/Ilig* (known in Hunnish, Magyar and Uyghur Turkish onomastic) is commonly found on the dynasty's coins, but is by no means general. The complete phrase *Ilek-Khān/Ilig-Khān* is an erroneous conflation: *Ilek/Ilig* and *Khān/Khākān/Kaghan* denoted two distinct ranks in the ruling hierarchy of the dynasty, the former being subordinate to the latter (cf. O. Turan, *Ilig unvani hakkında*, in *TM*, vii-viii (1940-2), 192-9). The name "Karakhānids" again stems from 19th century orientologists and numismatists. *Kara* (literally "black", but also used in early Turkish to designate the prime compass point of the north, hence acquiring the meaning "principal", "chief", cf. O. Pritsak, *Qara*, *Studie zur türkischen Rechtssymbolik*, in *Zeki Velidi Togan'a armağan*, Istanbul 1950-5, 239-63) occurs in the titulature of the Great Khāns of the dynasty. Contemporary Islamic sources often simply refer to the dynasty as "the Khāns" (*al-Khākāniyya*, *al-Khāniyya*); sometimes the phrase *Āl-i Afrāsiyāb* "House of Afrāsiyāb" is used, connecting the dynasty with the king of the Turanians in the Iranian national epic (= the Alp Er Tonga of Turkish lore, cf. Barthold, *Zwölf Vorlesungen* . . ., repr. 1962, 86-7, Fr. tr., *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, Paris 1945, 69-70).

In his *EI*<sup>1</sup> article, Barthold wrote that the historical references to the dynasty were very scanty, and Zambaur in his *Manuel*, 206, confessed that his section on the Karakhānids, "la seule grande dynastie musulmane dont la généalogie est restée obscure", was in large measure conjectural. The sources are not perhaps quite so scanty as Barthold supposed, and much light has now been thrown on the Karakhānids by O. Pritsak, who has given the first connected account of the dynasty; the historical section which follows here owes much to his work.

2. Historical. The Turkish tribal origins of the Karakhānids still remain obscure. Pritsak is probably correct in attaching them to the great tribal group of the Karluḡ [q.v.], who formed part of the confederation of the Orkhon Turks or T'u-chüeh, and then after 742 A.D., part of the tripartite confederation of the Karluḡ, Uyghur and Basml which succeeded

to the T'u-chüeh in Mongolia (*Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden*, 270 ff.). In the 3rd/9th century the Karluḡ began to clash with the Sāmānids on the northern fringes of Transoxania, and the Bilge Kül Ḳadr Khān who fought Nūh b. Asad is seemingly the first Karluḡ and Karakhānid ruler whose name is definitely known. The political and social structure which was to be characteristic of the confederation gradually becomes discernible. As amongst certain other Altaic peoples, there was a system of double kingship. The Great Khān ruled directly over the eastern part of the confederation, with his court at the encampment of Balāsāghūn or Kara Ordu in the Ču valley of Semirečye. The Associate Khān was under the supreme authority of the Great Khān, and also ruled directly over the western lands, with his encampment at Talas or Kāshghar. Beneath these two Khāns was a complicated hierarchy of subordinate Khāns and regional governors of the Karakhānid family. These rulers all bore Turkish regnal names and titles, including a totemistic one (*onghun*), and after their conversion to Islam they acquired Muslim names and patronymics also. The Turkish titles changed as members of the family moved up in the hierarchy. The disentangling of the genealogy and chronology of the dynasty, on the bases both of literary sources and of coins, is accordingly very difficult.

Military activity along the Sāmānid-Karakhānid borders, and commercial intercourse, led to the conversion of the Karakhānids in the course of the 4th/10th century. Much of this proselytizing work was doubtless done by dervishes and other Muslim enthusiasts; the name of one of these, Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad Kalimāti of Nishāpūr, is known (cf. Sam'āni, *Ansāb*, f. 486a). The head of the western Khānate, Satuḡ Bughra Khān (d. 344/955), became a Muslim and assumed the name of 'Abd al-Karīm, but the eastern Khānate was not Islamized till some time later, when Khotan and other towns of eastern Turkestan received the new faith. Ibn al-Athīr's report (viii, 396) that in 349/960 200,000 tents of Turkish tribesmen became Muslim is doubtless connected with this process. Karakhānid pressure southwards on the fertile and attractive lands of the Syr Darya basin was an important factor in the downfall of the Sāmānids at the end of the 4th/10th century. Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān in 382/992 occupied for a while the Sāmānid capital of Bukhārā. The Ilig Naṣr b. 'Alī of Özkend definitively took over Bukhārā in 389/999, and divided the Sāmānid dominions with Maḥmūd of Ghazna. However, the Ilig did not for some time to come accept the Oxus as the boundary between the two Turkish empires. Whilst Maḥmūd was pre-occupied by an expedition against Multān in India, he invaded Khurāsān in 396/1006, and the situation was only restored by Maḥmūd's hasty return. It was during these years that the western Karakhānids recognized fully the authority of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphs; this can be seen in the legends on their coins, where we often find the phrase *Mawlā Amir al-Mu'minin* after the Khāns' names. The early Khāns were further noted for their strict piety, expressed, for instance, in their avoidance of wine-drinking. The Karakhānids thus followed the generality of Turkish dynasties in accepting the orthodox Sunni form of Islam, together with the Ḥanafī law-school.

What has been said above about the internal structure of the Karakhānid confederation shows how these dominions were never ruled as a unitary state,

but instead as a loose, tribal grouping. In the early 5th/11th century, two distinct lines emerged within the dynasty. The first was that of the descendants of Satuḡ Bughra Khān's grandson 'Alī (the "Alids" in Pritsak's nomenclature); these supplied the Great Khāns of the western Khānate after the split within the dynasty described below. The second line was that of the descendants of Satuḡ Bughra Khān's other grandson Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān (the "Ḥasanids"); these supplied the Great Khāns for the eastern Khānate.

The system whereby various members of the family ruled simultaneously in different parts of the Karakhānid dominions inevitably led to disputes and rivalries. The Ghaznavid historian Bayhaḡi already speaks of warfare amongst "the Khāns and the Ilig" in the middle years of Maḡmūd of Ghazna's reign, and the Sultan encouraged these divisions in the hope of weakening the solidarity of the Karakhānids. In particular, he allied in 416/1025 with Yūsuf Qadr Khān b. Hārūn Bughra Khān of Khotan and Kāshghar (and after 417/1026, of the capital Özkend) against their mutual enemy, Yūsuf's brother 'Alī, known as 'Alī Tigin (see on the latter, O. Pritsak, *Karachanidische Streitfragen*. 3. *Wer war 'Alī Tigin?*, 216-24). 'Alī Tigin plays a central part in the history of Transoxania at this time; his power had a secure base in the rich cities of Bukhārā and Samarkand, and in alliance with the Saldjūḡ bands of Arslan Isrā'il, Toḡhril and Čaghri, he was the Ghaznavids' implacable foe until his death in 425/1034. 'Alī Tigin's sons, representing the Ḥasanid line, were not long able to retain their father's principality in Transoxania once he was dead. The whole region was gradually conquered by two brothers of the 'Alid line, Muḡammad 'Ayn al-Dawla and Böri Tigin, sons of the Ilig Naṣr. Muḡammad proclaimed himself Great Khān, and Böri Tigin became his Associate Khān (433/1041-2).

From this date onwards, there were two distinct Karakhānid Khānates (cf. O. Pritsak, *Karachanidische Streitfragen*. 4. *Zwei Karachanidische Kaganate*, 227-8). The eastern one comprised the original Karakhānid territories of Semirečye, eastern Farghāna and Kāshgharia, with Balāsāghūn or Kara Ordu as its capital and with Kāshghar as an important religious and cultural centre. The western one comprised Transoxania and western Farghāna as far as Khudjanda, with first Özkend and then Samarkand as its capital. The intermediate zone of the middle Syr Darya was frequently a subject of contention between the two branches.

The eastern branch of the Karakhānids, the Ḥasanids, soon conquered the whole of Farghāna. Their resources in manpower were augmented by the conversion to Islam of large numbers of pagan Turks from the outer steppes; thus in 435/1043-4 10,000 tents of Turks who nomadized "between Bulghār and Balāsāghūn" became Muslims. The Great Khān Muḡammad b. Yūsuf Qadr Khān was probably the grandfather of the pioneer Turkish lexicographer Maḡmūd Kāshghari [q.v.]; Maḡmūd's father was Amir of the district of Barskhān in Semirečye (cf. O. Pritsak, *Mahmud Kāshgari kimdir?*, in *TM*, x (1951-3), 243-6). During these years, Kāshghar grew as a centre for cultural and religious life, and it was there that Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Hādijib [q.v.] wrote his *Kutadghu bilig*, dedicating it to the Khān Ḥasan b. Sulaymān (467-96/1074-5 to 1102-3). In particular, Kāshghar speedily became the chief starting-point for the spread of Muslim faith and culture over the Tarim

basin and towards the frontiers of Mongolia and China.

Ḥasan Khān's son and successor Aḡmad held in check the Western Liao or Kara Khitāy [q.v.], a people who were probably of Mongol origin and who were at this time being forced to migrate westwards after the downfall of their two centuries' dominion in northern China. But after Aḡmad's death, the eastern Karakhānids were no longer able to stem the Kara Khitāy advance. Balāsāghūn fell under Kara Khitāy control and became their capital. Little is known of the eastern Karakhānid Khāns of the later 6th/12th century; they were willy-nilly vassals of the Kara Khitāy Gür-Khāns and now had their capital in Kāshghar. When the Nayman Mongol adventurer Küčlüḡ overthrew the Gür-Khān and established his ephemeral empire in Semirečye, he released the Karakhānid Muḡammad II from his previous detention at the Kara Khitāy court, and restored him to Kāshghar. Unfortunately, an internal revolt brought about the death of this last eastern Karakhānid before he could re-assume the throne (607/1210-11). Kāshghar passed into Küčlüḡ's hands and the eastern branch of the dynasty was finished.

The history of the western Khānate is better known than that of its eastern counterpart, for the Islamic historical sources deal more fully with Transoxanian events, these being frequently intertwined with happenings in Khurāsān. Ibrāhīm Tamghač Khān, the former Böri Tigin (ca. 444-60/ca. 1052-63), secured a leading place in the "Mirrors for Princes" and *adab* literature as the exemplar of a just and pious ruler, although the historical sources show that Ibrāhīm was at the same time involved in many clashes with the over-powerful and ambitious class of 'ulamā' in Transoxania. A serious external threat to these Karakhānids arose from the rise of the Great Saldjūḡ empire, which in the second half of the 5th/11th century was at its apogee under Alp Arslan and Malik Shāh [q.v.]. Ibrāhīm had already found it impossible to retain in face of Saldjūḡ pressure the upper Oxus provinces of Khuttal and Čaghāniyān, which he had earlier conquered from the Ghaznavids. His son Shams al-Mulk Naṣr (460-72/1068-80), famous for the splendour of his court and his patronage of scholars, had to endure a Saldjūḡ invasion in 465/1072-3; in the following year, he had to sue for peace at Samarkand with Malik Shāh, and to acknowledge Saldjūḡ suzerainty over Transoxania. Tension between the throne and the 'ulamā' was now a permanent feature of the western Khānate. In 482/1089 the religious classes called in Malik Shāh against Aḡmad Khān b. Khidr, and the Sultan penetrated as far as Özkend; soon afterwards, the 'ulamā' secured Aḡmad's deposition and execution on a charge of sympathy for the Ismā'ilis. The next Khāns seem to have been nominated by the Saldjūḡs. Muḡammad II b. Sulaymān (497-524/1102-30) was Sultan Sandjar's nephew and son-in-law, but his reign was much troubled by the activities of rival Karakhānid claimants.

Muḡammad's son Maḡmūd II was also Sandjar's nephew and was Great Khān from 526/1132 to 536/1141. It was he who came up against the Kara Khitāy. After reducing the eastern Karakhānids to submission, the Kara Khitāy marched westwards. In the great battle of the Kaṭwān Steppe in 536/1141, Sandjar and his Karakhānid protégé were disastrously defeated. Maḡmūd fled to Khurāsān, leaving the Gür-Khān to take over Transoxania. The Gür-Khān then set up various Karakhānid princes as his

puppets, although the real power in Bukhārā now lay with the Sunnī religious leaders or *Ṣudūr* of the Burhān family (see on these O. Pritsak, *Āl-i Burhān*, in *Isl.*, xxx (1952), 81-96), who collaborated closely with the pagan but tolerant Kara *Khitāy*. Maḥmūd II *Khān* remained in *Khurāsān* till his death in 559/1164; after Sandjar's capture by the *Ghuzz* he was acclaimed as Amir of *Khurāsān* by the leaderless Saldjūk army there (the famous poem, "The tears of *Khurāsān*", which lamented the ravages of the *Ghuzz*, was addressed by the Saldjūk poet Anwarī to Maḥmūd at this time), and he re-assumed this position after Sandjar's death in 552/1157.

With the deaths of Maḥmūd and his sons, the 'Alid branch of the Karakhānids came to an end, and rule over the western *Khānate* passed to the Ḥasanids or descendants of 'Alī Tigin. These Ḥasanid *Khāns* were, like their predecessors, much troubled internally by the turbulence of their *Qarluq* soldiery and tribesmen. Externally, they came to be overshadowed by the dynamic and ambitious *Khwārazm-Shāhs* of the line of Atslz. The last Karakhānid to rule over an exiguous principality around Bukhārā and Samarqand was 'Uthmān *Khān* b. Ibrāhīm. Squeezed between powerful neighbours, he vacillated between support for the *Khwārazm-Shāh* 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad and the Kara *Khitāy* *Gūr-Khān*, marrying princesses from both houses; but after the anti-*Khwārazmian* rising in Samarqand of 607/1210-11, the *Shāh* conquered the city and executed 'Uthmān, thus ending Karakhānid rule in Transoxania.

In Farghāna, Karakhānid princes lingered on for a few more years. It seems that a separate line had arisen here, centred on Özkend, after the Kara *Khitāy* invasion of 536/1141. One of these *Khāns*, Arslan, in 608/1211-12 threw off Kara *Khitāy* control and recognized the rising power of Čingiz-*Khān*. The line apparently persisted as governors of Farghāna under the first Mongol *Khāns*, but virtually nothing is known of them.

3. Cultural. Like the Saldjūk Sultans, the Karakhānid *Khāns* gradually assimilated themselves to the Perso-Islamic cultural and governmental traditions. The *Khān's* red ceremonial parasol or *čatr* is mentioned in the *Kutadghu bilig*. Such pious and just rulers as Ibrāhīm Tamghač *Khān* and *Shams al-Mulk Naṣr* conformed to the ideal of a Muslim ruler as laid down in the "Mirrors for Princes". *Shams al-Mulk* expended much effort on public buildings; he built two famous caravanserais (each called, after the royal builder, *Ribāṭ-i Malik*), reconstructed the Friday mosque of Bukhārā and laid out the palace of *Shamsābād* near that city. Muḥammad II b. Sulaymān was also a great builder, and restored the citadel of Bukhārā. Such traditional duties as the defence of the frontiers of the *Dār al-Islām* were undertaken by the *Khāns*, and we hear of Muḥammad II leading expeditions against the "infidels" of the steppes, probably the *Kıpçak*. Together with this extension of the faith by arms, the 6th/12th century was important for the spread of Islam within the *Kıpçak* steppe by peaceful means. The *Ṣūfī* *Shaykh* Aḥmad Yasawī [q.v.] of Sayram, and the order of the *Yasawiyya* which he founded, had a great influence in both eastern and western Turkestan and in the adjacent steppes; this may have been partly because the order in many ways adapted itself to and incorporated in itself certain pre-Islamic religious practices (cf. Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad, *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutaşavviflar*, abridged Fr. tr.

by L. Bouvat in *RMM*, xliii (1921), 239 ff., and idem, *Influence du chamanisme turco-mongol sur les ordres mystiques musulmans*, Istanbul 1929).

It has been noted above that the Karakhānids adopted enthusiastically the Ḥanafī law-school, and Transoxania was to become a stronghold of the Ḥanafī *madhhab* and the Māturīdī *kalām*, as the sheer volume of legal and theological literature emanating from the region attests. How great a part direct encouragement by the *Khāns* played here is uncertain, but the stimulus from them may well have been significant. In the *wakfiyya* for a *madrasa* (which was to include a mosque and tomb for the *Khān* himself) in the Bāb al-Djadid quarter of Samarqand, the founder Ibrāhīm Tamghač *Khān* stipulated that the *faqih* who was to teach there and all the students were to be of the school of Abū Ḥanifa; the date of the foundation, 458/1066, is further interesting in suggesting that the wave of *madrasa*-building associated with Nizām al-Mulk and other Saldjūk dignitaries may have had a counterpart in the Karakhānid dominions. Ibrāhīm's orthodox zeal is further shown in his suppression of an outbreak of Ismā'īlī activity in his *Khānate* in 436/1044-5, when Fātimid missionaries persuaded many of the local people to give allegiance to their Caliph in Cairo, al-Mustansir. But the accusations of Ismā'īlī sympathies brought against Aḥmad b. *Khiḍr Khān* in 488/1095 seem to have been purely a pretext raised by the *Khān's* unscrupulous opponents, and they do not reflect any general penetration of Transoxania by the Ismā'īlīs of Persia.

The *Khāns* encouraged circles of scholars and literary men at their courts, and the judgement of Grenard, "une dynastie de barbares grossiers et ignorants", is far too sweeping. Nizāmī 'Arūḍī Samarqandī (*Čahār maḳāla*, ed. Browne, 28, 46, revised tr. 30, 52; cf. Browne, ii, 335-6) cites thirteen poets who glorified the Āl-i *Khākān*, as he calls them; he particularly praises *Khiḍr Khān* b. Ibrāhīm (472-3/1080-1) as a munificent patron, in whose reign 'Am'ak of Bukhārā was laureate or *Amir al-Shu'arā'* and *Rashīdī* of Samarqand "Prince of poets" or *Sayyid al-Shu'arā'* (see further 'Awfī's section on the poets of Transoxania in *Lubāb al-albāb*, ed. S. Nafisi, Tehrān 1335/1956, 375-98, and Dawlatshāh in *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā'*, ed. M. 'Abbāsī, Tehrān 1337/1958, 73-6, on 'Am'ak).

With all this, the Karakhānids retained their strong Turkishness, and their age is of prime importance for the creation of a Turkish cultural consciousness and, in particular, for the creation of the first Turkish Islamic literature. Here the regions of Semirečye and *Kāshgharia*, now becoming strongly Turkicized, were prominent, rather than Transoxania, where Persian culture still retained pride of place. Cultural influences from the Uyghurs and even, to some extent, from distant China, were strong in these eastern Karakhānid provinces. The region of the Tarim basin, which included *Kāshghar* and *Khotan*, was often attributed by Muslim geographers to the marches of China, and indeed it had often been included within the Chinese empire. Hence we find that Yūsuf *Qadīr Khān*, after he had occupied and islamized *Khotan*, called himself *Malik al-Mashriq wa'l-Šīn* "King of the East and China". This title is further found on coins minted by his distant kinsman Ibrāhīm Tamghač *Khān* and dating from after 451/1059, and in the 'alāma or *validatio* of a *wakfiyya* for a hospital founded by the *Khān* in 458/1066 (see M. Khadr in *JA* (1967), 320, 324, and

also the anecdote concerning the titles of the Karakhānids and Maḥmūd of Ghazna's jealousy over them, given in Nizām al-Mulk's *Siyāsat-nāma*, ch. xl. and discussed by Bosworth in *Oriens*, xv (1962), 225-6). The legends of Karakhānid coins also show that the Uyghur script was used side-by-side with the Arabic. The *Kutadghu bilig* of Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Hādhib [q.v.] was completed at Kāshghar in 462/1069-70 and dedicated to the then ruling Khān. Four years later, Maḥmūd Kāshghari [q.v.] completed his *Diwān lughāt al-Turk*, with the express aim of demonstrating that the Turkish language was comparable to Arabic in its richness. The didactic nature of early Turkish poetry was continued at the end of the Karakhānid period in the *Atabat al-ḥakā'ik* of Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd; the existence of this work shows that the *Kutadghu bilig* was by no means an isolated phenomenon. Shaykh Aḥmad Yasawī (d. 562/1166) left behind a collection of vernacular Turkish verse, the *Diwān-i hikmet*, although this is now regarded as of doubtful authenticity.

4. General conclusions. The limitations of source material make it difficult to assess the general historical significance of the Karakhānids and difficult to evaluate the changes which their rule brought to Transoxania and the adjacent lands. As with the Saldjūks, we have the establishment of a Muslim Turkish power, not by Turkish slave commanders (as in the case of the Ghaznavids) but by tribal leaders and their hordes. Compared with the preceding régime of the Sāmānids, the Karakhānids brought about a decentralization of administration and a fragmentation of authority in Transoxania. One of the continuators of the historian of Bukhārā, Narshakhi, says that taxes were everywhere lightened when the Karakhānids supplanted the Sāmānids, and it is further probable that indigenous landed classes there, the *dihkāns*, enjoyed a resurgence of local power. The Khāns remained close to their Karluḡ followers, who comprised such tribes as the Čigil and Yaghmā; certainly, in the time of Shams al-Mulk Naṣr the Khāns were nomadic during the summer months, residing in their capitals only during the harsh steppe winters. Unfortunately, we know little about changes in land utilization and tenure, although it seems likely that the influx of pastoral nomads did cause some changes. The mention during Shams al-Mulk Naṣr's reign of *ghuruḡs* or tracts of hunting ground established as crown preserves (Continuator of Narshakhi, tr. R. Frye, *The history of Bukhara*, Cambridge, Mass. 1954, 29, 125) may indicate a certain extension of pastoralization.

The Karakhānid territories shared in the general economic trend, whose causes remain obscure, whereby silver coinage tended to be replaced by gold. Nevertheless, the dirham remained the standard coin circulating in Transoxania, and both dirhams *mu'ayyadiyya 'adliyya* and the slightly baser *ghifriyya* ones circulated in the later 5th/11th century and the early 6th/12th century. These dirhams were, however, considerably debased in relation to the legal *dinār*, and the currency was obviously somewhat unstable at this time; the testimony of the *wakfiyya* for Ibrāhīm Tamghač Khān's *madrassa*, mentioned above, suggests a figure of 47 dirhams *mu'ayyadiyya 'adliyya* to the *dinār* instead of the legally desirable figure of 14<sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub> (cf. Cahen, in *JA* (1967), 309-10, and Continuator of Narshakhi, tr. Frye, 36).

Yet despite the Khāns' identification with their

tribal contingents, their positions as Muslim sovereigns over such rich and fertile regions as Transoxania and Farghānā inevitably tended to raise them above the general tribal level. As happened within the Great Saldjūḡ Sultanate, social and political tensions were generated. During the 6th/12th century, the Khāns were continually at odds with their military supporters, the Karluḡ tribesmen, often with dangerous consequences; it was Maḥmūd II's appeal to Sandjar in 536/1141 for help against the Karluḡ that determined the latter to call in the Kara Khitāy as a counterweight. It is not clear exactly how the Khāns fell foul of the religious classes in Bukhārā and Samarkand, orthodox 'ulamā' and 'Alids alike, but this too caused tensions which led at times to bloodshed and executions. The explanation is probably that the religious institution resented any extension of the central government's power, and were ready to join with the military against the throne. The situation here parallels that obtaining in the Sāmānid period, and is an instance of the essential continuity of the structure of power and society in Transoxania. Because of these tensions, and because of the fragmentation of power within the ruling dynasty itself, the Karakhānids were ill-prepared to withstand such resolute opponents as the Kara Khitāy and the Khwārazm-Shāhs.

*Bibliography:* A detailed bibliography is given by O. Pritsak at the end of his article *Die Karachaniden* (see below), 63-8. The pre-Muslim history of the Karluḡ can be pieced together from the diverse sources which bear on the history of Central Asia: Chinese, Uyghur, Orkhon Turkish, Byzantine, etc. For Muslim historians, the Karakhānids inhabited only the periphery of the Islamic world, and they tend to mention the Khāns only so far as they impinge on the wider eastern Islamic world. There are, however, important notices in such authors as 'Utbi, Gardizi, Bayhaḡi, continuators of Narshakhi, Nizām al-Mulk, Djamāl Karshī, Nasawī, Djuwaynī and Ibn al-Athīr. Light is thrown on the culture of the Karakhānid period by the works of such authors as Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Hādhib, Maḥmūd Kāshghari, al-Kātib al-Samarḡandī, etc., and by the anecdotes given by Nizāmi 'Arūḡi and 'Awfi. Amongst secondary literature, the following should be noted: E. Sachau, *Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwarāzm*, in *SBAk. Wien*, lxxiv (1873), 319-30; Sir H. Howorth, *The northern frontagers of China. IX. The Muhammadan Turks of Turkestan from the tenth to the thirteenth century*, in *JRAS* (1898), 467-502; F. Grenard, *La légende de Satok Boghra Khan et l'histoire*, in *JA*, Ser. 9, xv (1900), 5-79; Barthold, *Turkestan*; idem, *Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, repr. Hildesheim 1962, Fr. tr., *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, Paris 1945; idem, *A short history of Turkestan and History of the Semirechye*, in *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, i, Leiden 1956; R. Vasmer, *Zur Münzkunde der Qarāhāniden*, in *MSOS As.*, xxxiii (1930), 83-104; O. Pritsak, *Karachanidische Streitfragen 1-4*, in *Oriens*, iii (1950), 209-28; idem, *Von den Karluḡ zu den Karachaniden*, in *ZDMG*, ci (1951), 270-300; idem, *Die Karachaniden*, in *Isl.*, xxxi (1953-4), 17-68 (Turkish version in *IA Art. "Karahānlılar"*); A. Z. V. Togan, *Zentral-asiatische Türkische Literaturen. II. Die Islamische Zeit*, in *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Abt. I, Bd. 5/i *Turkologie*, Leiden 1963, 229-33; A. Caferoḡlu, *La littérature turque de l'époque des Karakhanides*, in *Funda-*

*menta philologiae turcicae*, ii, Wiesbaden 1964, 267-75; C. E. Bosworth, *The Islamic dynasties, a chronological and genealogical handbook*, Edinburgh 1967, III-14; idem, in *Cambridge history of Iran*, v, Cambridge 1968; Emel Esin, *Türk san'at tarihinde Kara-hanlı devrinin mevkii*, in VI. *Türk tarih kongresinin bildirileri*, Ankara 1967, 100-30; M. Khadr and Cl. Cahen, *Deux actes de waqf d'un Qaraqānide d'Asie Centrale*, in *JA* (1967), 305-34.

(C. E. BOSWORTH)

**ILERI, DJELĀL NŪRĪ**, in modern Turkish CELAL NURI İLERİ, Turkish modernist, writer, publicist and journalist, 1877-1938. He was born at Gallipoli. His father, Helvādīzade Muşafā Nūri, from Crete, served as governor in various provinces and became a senator in 1908. His mother was the daughter of 'Abidin Pasha (surnamed Dino, 1843-1908) from Prizrin, a governor and vizier under 'Abd al-Ḥamid II and the author of a well-known commentary on the *Mathnawī*. One of his brothers, Şubhī Nūri İleri was a socialist writer and journalist and the other, Sedād Nūri, a painter and cartoonist.

Educated at Galatasaray lycée and Istanbul University, where he studied law, Djelāl Nūri perfected his French to the point of publishing a few books in that language, including a novel, *Cauchemar*, about life in Istanbul under 'Abd al-Ḥamid. He also learnt English. His education owes much to his family circle, which included his paternal uncle Sirri Pasha and his wife, Leylā Saz (1850-1936), the poetess and composer, and author of valuable memoirs of 19th century *harem* life.

Djelāl Nūri visited Europe several times and published some of his impressions in two books: *Kuṭub muşāhabeleri* and *Şimāl khāṭıraları* (see below). He soon abandoned the legal profession to become a journalist and free-lance writer. He contributed to many newspapers and periodicals (some of which he founded), particularly *Ikdām*, *Ātī*, *Ileri*, *İdjtihād*, *Edebiyyāt-i 'Umūmiyye Medjmu'asi*, *Therwet-i Fünūn*, *Türk Yurdu*, *Le Courrier d'Orient* and *Le Jeune Turc*. He wrote more than fifteen hundred articles in the last-named French language newspapers, many of great documentary value for the period following the mutiny of 13 April 1909 ("31 Mart waḳ'asi").

Djelāl Nūri represented Gelibolu in the last Ottoman Parliament, and was elected four times to the Grand National Assembly. His wide legal knowledge and his familiarity with both Eastern and Western culture made him one of the most sought-after advisers of the new Nationalist Government in Ankara. He was an honest, straightforward writer, always consistent in his principles and in his advocacy of liberalism and honest government. His strong criticism, in his Istanbul daily *Ileri*, of authoritarian rule and its abuses, and his contention that the single-party system was incompatible with democracy, resulted in violent polemics in the press. Several extremist supporters of the Government, particularly Aghaoghlu Ahmed and Yūnus Nādi, violently attacked him in Government organs. A member of Parliament, Kılıdī 'Ali, whose name was published in a list of deputies and officials accused of having misused their influence, went to Djelāl Nūri's office and attacked him (for details of this polemic and the subsequent incident, see the newspapers *Ileri*, *Hākimiyyet-i Milliyye*, *Djumhūriyyet* and *Şon Telghraf* for June to August 1340 (fiscal)/1924. Djelāl Nūri's journalist brother Şubhī Nūri published a strong article of protest the following

day in *Ileri* (31 July 1924). But Djelāl Nūri himself henceforward wrote only occasionally in the same paper, and avoided polemics. He died in Istanbul on 2 November 1938.

Djelāl Nūri is the author of some thirty books and thousands of articles, a few of which have been collected in book form. Without fully adhering to any of the three main groups of the post-1908 period, i.e., "Turkists", Islamists, and Westernizers, he made his own compromise between the last two. He conducted long polemics on social, political, religious, juridical and linguistic issues with leading writers of the period, and opposed equally the extremist Nationalists, the radical Westernizers and the uncompromising Islamists [see GÖKALP, DJEWDET, MEHMET 'AKIF, PANISLAMISM, TURAN].

He himself was a moderate reformist. But he was no systematic thinker, so that his ideas and suggestions on various problems crop up in most of his writings no matter the subject title. The following are his most outstanding themes on controversial issues of the period 1908-23.

The legal system. The need for a radical reform in this field is one of his main themes. The legal system of a country must take into consideration the historical development, the character, peculiarities, conditions of life of the nation and the requirements of the contemporary age. Midhat Pasha's Constitution, Djewdet Pasha's *Medjelle* and many laws dealing with administration, jurisprudence, property, the civil service etc., are, since they ignore these conditions, inadequate. Laws are not unalterable; on the contrary they should at times be reviewed and modified according to the changing circumstances of the times.

The emancipation of women. Many social evils in Ottoman society have as their primary cause the humiliating position of women. Polygamy should be prohibited and women should not be treated as property. Laws concerning marriage, divorce and children should be modernized. This too is in keeping with the spirit of Islam; whose rules on women and marriage have been misinterpreted for centuries. Djelāl Nūri's ideas on this subject were by many found to be "too progressive".

The causes of Ottoman decline. The main causes for the backwardness of the Ottomans are that they had no part in the maritime discoveries, the Renaissance, and the exploitation of printing.

Alphabet and language reform. The Arabic alphabet not being suitable for Turkish, a reformed alphabet based on the Roman script is necessary. As far as the language itself is concerned, however, Djelāl Nūri's approach is conservative. He saw the Persian-Arabic elements as being as natural and necessary to Turkish as Latin and French words are to English. Yet his campaign against the supporters of "simplification" mellowed later in the republican period.

Reform in Islam. Islam *per se* has never been an obstacle to progress. But it has been constantly misinterpreted and exploited by bigots and opportunists. A reform in Islam, particularly in Muslim law, is necessary. The unity of the Muslim world should be the ideal, and should replace the nationalistic ideologies of individual Muslim nations. Yet the ideal of a theocratic state is an anachronism. To ignore Western civilization leads nowhere. But there are two civilizations: the technological and the real civilization. The Turks, like the Japanese, should adopt the first, but preserve their own Muslim-

even Šūfis raised the question of the certainty of the knowledge given by it. So al-Hudjwiri (*Kāshf al-mah-djūb*, transl. Nicholson, 271) contends that *ilhām* cannot give assured knowledge (*ma'rifa*) of Allāh; but al-Ghazālī would probably have said that al-Hudjwiri was using *ilhām* in the sense of an idea which one found in his mind, and not of the flashing out of the divine light on the soul which, once experienced, can never be mistaken. Others taught that, while it was sufficient for the recipient, it could not be used to convince others or reckoned as a source of knowledge for men in general. This appears to have been al-Nasafi's position; see his *'Aḥādīd* with commentaries of al-Taftāzāni and others, Cairo ed. 1321, 40 f. A very curious use is by Ibn Khaldūn in the sense of "instinct" (*Muḥaddima*, ed. Quatremère, ii, 331, transl. de Slane, ii, 384; tr. Rosenthal, ii, 370) but this, though a natural development, does not seem to have been taken up by others. Yet Ibn Ḥazm speaks of *ilhām* as a *ṭabi'a* and refers as an illustration to *Ḳur'ān*, XVI, 70, on the instinct of bees (*Milal*, v, 17).

*Bibliography*: Add to references above: *Dict. of technical terms*, 1308; al-Djurdjāni, *Ta'rifāt*, Cairo 1321, 22 foot; Rāghib al-Iṣfahāni, *Mufradāt*, 471; L. Massignon, *Tawāsīn*, 125-8.

(D. B. MACDONALD\*)

**ILI**, a large river in Central Asia. It is formed by the two rivers Tekes and Kunges, which rise on the northern slopes of the T'ien-Shan Mts.; the united stream of the Ili then flows for some 950 kms. across the northern part of the region known in mediaeval times as "the land of the seven rivers", Yeti-su or Semirečye, into Lake Balkhash. The lower course of the Ili falls within the Soviet Kazakhstan Republic, whilst the eastern part of the Ili river system belongs to the Chinese Sinkiang-Uyghur Autonomous Region.

The Ili is first mentioned in the history of the Chinese T'ang dynasty, when one of the main roads from China to Turkestan passed through its valley (Chavannes, *Documents sur les Toukioue (Turcs) occidentaux*, 11 ff.). The oldest Muslim source to mention it is the *Hudud al-'ālam* (372/982-3), which says that the Ilā runs into the Isḳ-Köl (the existence of Lake Balkhash was not known to early Islamic geographers). Kāshghari calls the Ilā or Ilā "the Djayhūn of the Turkish country", and he places the Turkish tribe of the Tukhsī in the Ili valley, together with the Yaghmā and part of the Čigil (tr. Atalay, i, 30, 81, 92, 408). The *Hudūd* mentions a town in this region, probably to be identified with Kāshghari's frontier town Iki-ögüz "[situated] between the two rivers", i.e., the Ili and Yafindj, cf. *Hudūd*, 71, 208, 276-7, 300-1.

It is not known when Islam first came to the Ili valley, but in the 7th/13th century it was regarded as marking the farthest boundary of the *Dār al-Islām*, and the lands to the east were only converted in the post-Mongol period. Immediately before the Mongol period, northern Semirečye, including the town of *Ḳayallgh* (see below), was ruled by the *Ḳarluḳ Arslan Khān*. He threw off *Ḳara Khitay* suzerainty and negotiated with Čingiz; consequently, the region did not suffer from the Mongol devastations so badly as Transoxania and *Khurāsān*. The upper parts of the Ili basin contained good pasture for the nomads, and Čaghatay had his *ordu* on the Ili after Čingiz's death. The reports of such travellers as Rubruck (651/1253) and the Chinese envoy to Hūlegü's court Chang-tē (657/1259) show that the Ili region was still reason-

ably flourishing, but that there was a trend towards pastoralization. Rubruck mentions that after crossing the Ili, he came to the town of Equius (sc. Ili-ballḳ "town on the Ili"), whose population was Tādjk, and the Armenian King Haiton (Het'um) also visited it. The nearby town of Cailac (sc. *Ḳayallgh*) is also described as having many merchants (cf. E. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval researches from eastern Asiatic sources*, i, 169), and the trading centre of *Almallgh* [q.v.], to the north of the Ili, was at this time the capital of a small Muslim principality. By the 9th/15th century, however, urban life seems to have disappeared from the region.

From the later 17th century until the destruction of Kalmuck power in Turkestan in 1758, Semirečye and the Ili valley were occupied by the Buddhist Kalmucks or Oyrat. During the time of the great *Khān Ghaldan* (d. 1108/1697), the Ili valley became regarded as the *Khān's* personal domain. In the 19th century, it was part of the lands of the *Ḳazaḳs*, but during the reign of Tsar Nicholas I was annexed by Russia. The upper Ili valley, and especially the town of *Ḳuldja* [q.v.], suffered considerably during the Muslim rebellion in Chinese Turkestan led by Ya'qūb Beg. Because of Russian fears that the outbreak might spread, the district of *Ḳuldja* was in 1871 annexed by Russia, but given back to China in 1883.

During the present century, the main centres of population have been *Ḳuldja* and the small town of Ili, situated at the junction of the river and the Turkestan-Siberia railway. Navigation is possible during the ice-free months on the Soviet part of the river down to a point near the delta; the waters of the Ili's tributaries are extensively used for irrigation, and the upper reaches are an important source of hydro-electric power (see *BSE*<sup>2</sup>, xvii, 530-1, with a map).

*Bibliography*: In the text.

(C. E. BOSWORTH)

**ILİÇPUR** [see Supplement].

**İLİDJA** (r.) "hot spring", and a bath served by a hot spring (whereas in principle, in Ottoman usage, a *ḥammām* [q.v.] is a bath whose water is artificially heated), a characteristically Western Turkish word, the diminutive(?) of *ilī* "hot" (< *ilīg*, cited by Maḥmūd Kāshghari, Ar. text, i, 31 = tr. B. Atalay, i, 31, in contrast to "Turkish" *yilīg*, as an example of the Oghuz tendency to drop initial y-).

According to 'Aṣim (T. translation of al-Firūzābādī's *Muḥit*, s.v. *al-ḥimma*, = ed. of 1268-72, iii, 435; cited in *TTS*, i, 349), a thermal and curative spring is called "*ilidja* in Turkish, *ḳapludja* in Bursa, and *bāna* [cf. Serbo-Croat *banja*] in Rumeli"; Redhouse distinguishes *ḳapludja* as "a hot spring roofed in [*ḳaplu*] as a bath; especially any one of the hot-baths of Brousa". These distinctions are perhaps etymological rather than real: *ḳapludja* [q.v.] is admittedly used primarily of the baths, served by thermal springs, in the Čekirge suburb of Bursa; and Evliyā Čelebi says of Sofia (iii, 399) "in these regions an *ilidja* is called *bānā*"; yet he himself uses the word *ilidja* for the baths of Sofia and Buda (vi, 242 ff.), and so too Feridūn (i<sup>2</sup>, 599) uses the terms *bāna* and *ilidja* without apparent distinction in a "Rumelian" context.

*Ilidja* is a common toponym in Anatolia (over thirty attestations in *Türkiye'de meskûn yerler kılavuzu*, Ankara 1946-50). (ED.)

**İLİYĀ** [see AL-ḲUDS].

**ILKHĀNĪ** [see TA'RĪKH].

**ILKHĀNS**, Mongol dynasty ruling in