

# THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF  
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

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

ASSISTED BY †C. DUMONT, GENERAL SECRETARY, G. R. HAWTING  
AND MISS M. PATERSON, EDITORIAL SECRETARIES (pp. 1-256)

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

ASSISTED BY †C. DUMONT, GENERAL SECRETARY,  
AND MISS M. PATERSON, EDITORIAL SECRETARY (pp. 257-768)

ASSISTED BY F. TH. DIJKEMA, M<sup>LLE</sup> M. LEFORT AND M<sup>ME</sup> S. NURIT (pp. 769-1188)

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME IV

IRAN—KHA



LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1978

*Bibliography:* J. L. Combes and A. Louis, *Les poteries de Djerba*, Tunis 1967; W. Luadi, *Töpferi und Töpferdörfer in Tunesien*, in *Kosmos*, ii (Stuttgart 1961), 478-88; S. Tlatli, *Djerba, l'île des Lotophages*, Tunis 1967; W. Vycichl, *Begadkhepat (Djerba, Gellala)*, in *Proceedings of the Hamito-Semitic Colloquium*, London 1970.

(W. VYICHL)

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

From the time of Ways Khān (1418-28) the Mongols on the Ili [q.v.] had to fight against the "infidel Kalmak"; accounts of these wars are given in the *Ta'rikh-i Rashidi*. Ways Khān was twice taken prisoner by the Kalmuks and had to give his sister in marriage to their chief, Esen Tayshi. Toghon, the latter's father, was then ruling in Mongolia on the Chinese frontier, where he was succeeded in 1439 by Esen Tayshi. After the death of Esen Tayshi (1455) the great nomad empire of the Oyrat broke up; individual princes are mentioned from time to time later as ruling in the neighbourhood of Muslim lands; at the beginning of 864/end of 1459 a Kalmuk embassy appeared in Harāt. The Muslim sources also report the restoration of the Oyrat empire under Khara Khula (d. 1634). In Turkestan during this period also the Kalmuks were regarded as powerful foes of Islam. The Kazakh Khān Tawakkul (Tefkel in Russian) had to flee before them to Tashkent, where he was received by the Özbek ruler Nawrūz Ahmad (d. 963/1556); in reply to his appeal for help, Nawrūz declared that even ten princes such as themselves would be no match for the Kalmuks. At a later date, however, on the occasion of his embassy to Tsar Feodor (1594), Tawakkul was described in Russian documents as "king of the Kazakhs and Kalmuks", perhaps because a few bands of Kalmuks had attached themselves to him. In the winter of 1603-4 there occurred the first incursion of the Kalmuks into Khwārizm. Soon after, under Tsar Vasili Shuisky (1606-1610), the Kalmuks entered into relations with the Russian government for the first time, though it was not until 1632 that they settled on the Volga on a large scale. This branch of the Kalmuks had separated from their kinsmen, under the leadership of Kho-Örlök, as early as 1618. The territory of the Volga Kalmuks did not therefore form part of the empire founded by Khara-Khula, although relations between the two branches of the people had not yet been severed. Representatives of the Volga Kalmuks still appeared at the *kuriltay* [q.v.] of 1640; Batur, the son and successor of Khara-Khula, gave his daughter in marriage to the grandson of Kho-Örlök. By the same *kuriltay* the dominance of Buddhism was firmly established among all branches of the Kalmuks. The progress made by Islam described in the *Ta'rikh-i Rashidi* (p. 91) in

connexion with the above-mentioned marriage was apparently not maintained. Most of the Muslim territories in Turkestan were under the suzerainty of the Buddhist Kalmuk ruler on the Ili, the founder of the last great nomad empire in Central Asia, which lasted until it was destroyed by the Chinese in 1758; as late as 1749 the regent (*atalik*) of Bukhārā and his opponent had to submit a dispute to the verdict of an embassy from the Kalmuk ruler. A great part of the Kazakhs' pasture land was now seized by the Kalmuks, and Islam was almost completely banished from the southern part of Semireč'ye. Several Buddhist monuments, including Tibetan inscriptions, date from this period. It was only after the decline of the Kalmuk empire that these areas were re-occupied by the Muslim Kazakhs. The wars of the Volga Kalmuks with the Crimean Tartars and their raids into Khwārizm had less effect on Islam; from 1724 the Kalmuk chiefs on the lower course of the Volga were regarded simply as viceroys (*namestnik*) of the Russian tsar. They had no longer any connexion with the ruler on the Ili. The decision of the "viceroy" Ubashi and a large number (about 300,000) of his people to migrate from Russia and settle in Chinese territory proved disastrous to the Volga Kalmuks. During the migration heavy losses were inflicted on them in Central Asia, especially by the Kazakhs (1771). Henceforth the Kalmuks were of no political significance in either Russia or in China. During the Muslim rising in the Ili valley the great Kalmuk temple of Buddha near Kuldj was destroyed.

*Bibliography:* *The Cambridge History of Iran*, v, ch. 4, Cambridge 1968; N. Elias and Denison Ross, *A history of the Moghuls of Central Asia, being the Tarikh-i Rashidi of Mirza Muhammad Dughlat*, London 1898; V. V. Barthold, *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, tr. V. and I. Minorsky, i, Leiden 1956; W. Radloff, *Aus Siberien*, ii, Leipzig 1884; P. Pelliot, *Notes critiques d'histoire kalmouke*, Paris 1960.

(J. A. BOYLE)

#### THE MODERN PERIOD.

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

*Bibliography:* *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia*; R. Conquest, *The Soviet deportation of nationalities*, London 1960, 36-41, 134-43. (G. E. WHEELER).  
KALPAK [see LIBAS].

engaged the Sokoto 'ulamā' in a famous correspondence which seriously weakened their resolve to continue *djihād* against Bornū, and he contained the emirates of Katagum and Haḍḍjia by a great campaign in 1826 which carried him as far as Kano before he was forced to withdraw. He secured the eastern frontier south of Lake Chad by operations against Bagarmi in 1821-4. In the first of these he was assisted by the Ottoman *kā'im-makām* of the Fazzān [q.v.], and he later maintained the Fazzānī connection (of commercial importance to Bornū) by alliance with the Awlād Sulaymān, who also helped him strengthen his influence in Kānem as a buffer against Wadā'i.

As well as this, he radically reformed the structure of government in Bornū, replacing the ancient and ineffective feudal levies of the Mais by a new army of Kānembu infantry and Shuwa Arab cavalry with a *mamlūk* officer corps owing personal loyalty to him. The old Kanūri fief-holding offices remained in existence, but fiefs were progressively transferred to supporters of al-Kānemī, and a new council of advisers dominated the government. These advisers, mainly non-Kanūri, represented a new and reforming element in Bornuan politics.

Al-Kānemī, though a scholar of considerable standing, was not a prolific writer, only one short work of *fiqh*, *Naṣīhat al-ḥukkām*, and a poem, *Nasīm al-ṣabā*, being certainly attributable to him. A number of his letters, however, are preserved.

*Bibliography*: Muḥammad Bello, *Infāk al-maysūr* (1813), London 1951, Cairo 1960; D. Denham and H. Clapperton, *Narrative of travels and discoveries in North and Central Africa*, London 1826; Y. Urvoy, *Histoire de l'empire du Bornou*, Paris 1949; L. Brenner, *The Shehus of Kukawa*, unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Columbia 1968.

(ABDULLAH SMITH)

**KANGĀWAR** [see KINKIWAR].

**KANGHLI**, **KANKLI**, the name of a Turkish people living in mediaeval times in the steppes of Turkestan and south-western Siberia. We do not find mention of the Kānghlī in the oldest Arab and Persian geographers and travellers of the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries, as we do of several other Turkish tribes. For Maḥmūd Kāshgharī, *kankli* was not an ethnic designation, but was, as a proper noun, "the name of a great man of the Kīpčak", and as a common noun, "a heavily-loaded cart" (*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, tr. Atalay, iii, 379). In some early Turkish sources on the legendary origins of the Turkish tribes, e.g., the *Oghuz-nāma*, we find the story that the tribe got its name from the man who first constructed and used these heavy wagons for transport across the steppes (see Marquart, *Komanen*, 163); but Sir Gerard Clauson thought it equally likely that the wagon used by the Turks got its name of *kañli/kanghlī* from the fact that it was introduced by the Kānghlī people to the steppe Turks, see his *The name Uyğur*, in *JRAS* (1963), 147-8, and *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*, 638.

The Kānghlī are most frequently mentioned in the sources pertaining to the century or so preceding the Mongol invasions of the 7th/13th century, and are often spoken of as part of the Kīpčak confederation, i.e., they belonged ethnically to the south-western group of Turkish peoples. They are also associated with the Kimāk [q.v.], themselves apparently one of the tribal groups eventually forming the Kīpčak. Concerning their habitat, Abu 'l-Ghāzī in his *Shadjaru-yi Tarākima* retails a legend that the Kānghlī had a *khān*, Gök-Toñlī, whose centre was on the

Yayik or Ural River (Barthold, *Four studies*, iii. *A history of the Turkman people*, 132), but by the beginning of the 7th/13th century they and the Kīpčak were also close neighbours of the Mongol Nayman on the Irtysh (idem, *Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, 151, Fr tr. *Histoire des turcs d'Asie Centrale*, 118). Minorsky read a passage in one of the manuscripts of Djūz-djānī's *Tabakāt-i nāṣiri*, where there is mentioned a punitive expedition into the steppes in 615/1216 by the Khwārazm-Shāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad, as referring to "Kādīr Khān Yighur, ruler of the Kānghlī Tatars", whose lands stretched far north into the region of perpetual twilight in summer (see *Hudūd al-'ālam*, 309). It seems that the Kānghlī nomadised over an extensive area of western Siberia, but came as far south as the Sir Daryā and northern fringes of Transoxania, where Djuwaynī mentions them several times in his story of the irruption of the Mongols into Transoxania. Kānghlī and Karluq [q.v.] had been amongst the rebellious troops of the Karā Khānid ruler, and their unruliness had led the latter potentate to call in the Karā Khitāy, with disastrous results to his line [see KARĀ KHITĀY].

At the time of the Mongols' appearance, the Kānghlī had a settlement called Karākum on the lower Sir Daryā, not far from Djand [q.v.], mentioned as the place to which the Merkit fled after Čingiz Khān had defeated them and the Nayman on the Irtysh in 1208; it was also the place where in 617/1220 the Mongol general Čin Temür rested before going on to occupy Djand (Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, 361-2, 370, 415). Many Kānghlī tribesmen obviously formed part of the Khwārazmian armies confronting the incoming Mongols, and they suffered heavy losses when Bukhārā and Samarkand were stormed by the Mongols; there seems to have been some dynastic connection between the Khwārazm-Shāhs and the Kānghlī, if Djuwaynī's report that Sulṭān Djalāl al-Dīn's mother Terken Khātūn was a Kānghlī is true (see Djuwaynī, tr. Boyle, i, 91, 106, 121, ii, 370, 465, and Barthold, *op. cit.*, 415; Nasawī, however, makes Terken Khātūn from the Baya'ut branch of the associated tribe of the Kimāk/Yimāk). Those of the Kānghlī not massacred by the Mongols must have melted into the Turkish hordes making up a large proportion of the Mongol armies; western travellers to the court of the Mongol Khāns like John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck mention them as the Cangitae and Cangle respectively. Thereafter, they disappear from recorded history. They can hardly have been touched by Islam; indeed, the only reference to their religious beliefs is that the Mongol general Toluy Khān or Ulugh Noyan employed a Kānghlī versed in the art of using the *yay* or rainstone (i.e., he was a *shaman*) to conjure up rain during his campaign against the Chinese in 628/1231 (Djuwaynī-Boyle, i, 193; Boyle, *The successors of Genghis Khan*, New York and London 1971, 37).

*Bibliography*: in addition to the references given in the article, see especially Marquart's detailed discussion of the Kānghlī in his *Über das Volkstum der Komanen*, in *Abh. G. W. Gött.*, N. F., xiii (1914), 163-72. (C. E. BOSWORTH)

**KIANGHRĪ** [see ČANKIRĪ].

**KĀNGRĀ**, the Nagarkoī of Muslim historians of India, occasionally referred to as Kōt Kānūgā, is also the headquarters of the *taḥṣil* of the same name in the Indian Panḍjāb. Kānūgā lies between 30° 5' N. and 76° 16' E. on the northern slope of the

(Dhu ʿl-Kadr, [q.v.]) principality, at that time, under ʿAlāʾ al-Dawla, a dependency of the Mamlūk sultanate, to which it was of great strategic importance. Sibāy prepared an expedition from Damascus, but hostilities were averted. Thereafter for some years relations were peaceful.

The accession of Selīm I as Ottoman sultan dramatically altered the situation. Al-Ghawrī tried to profit from the developing crisis between Selīm and Shāh Ismāʿīl. The Ottoman victory at Čaldırān [q.v.] on 2 Rādjab 920/23 August 1514, however, alarmed al-Ghawrī and his *amirs*. Selīm's hostility towards ʿAlāʾ al-Dawla of Dulgadīr, who had refused to help the Ottomans, immediately threatened Mamlūk interests. The Ottomans defeated and killed ʿAlāʾ al-Dawla (Rabīʿ II 921/June 1515). The passing of the Dulgadīr principality under Ottoman domination alarmed the *amirs* in Cairo, while Sibāy and the governor of Aleppo, Khāʾir Bey (who was already in touch with Selīm), reproached al-Ghawrī for his delay in sending reinforcements. In spite of the serious financial situation and the demoralization of his forces, al-Ghawrī prepared an expedition, and on 15 Rabīʿ II 922/18 May 1516, he left Cairo. Tūmān Bāy was appointed viceroy (*nāʾib al-ghayba*), but the effective control of the administration was in the hands of Zayn al-Dīn Barakāt.

On 10 Djumādā II/11 July, al-Ghawrī reached Aleppo, where Ottoman ambassadors presented a conciliatory message from Selīm, to whom al-Ghawrī in turn sent peace proposals. Selīm, who intended another campaign against the Şafawids, decided, however, first to end the danger to his flank. Conflict was now inevitable, and a decisive battle ensued at Mardj Dābiq, north of Aleppo, on 25 Rādjab 922/24 August 1516. The flight of the Mamlūk left wing, commanded by Khāʾir Bey (who was probably in secret understanding with the Ottomans), led to the break-up of the whole Mamlūk position. In the confusion, al-Ghawrī fell from his horse and died, apparently of apoplexy. His body was never recovered.

*Bibliography:* Ibn Iyās, *K. badāʾiʿ al-zuhūr fī wakāʾiʿ al-duhūr*, in *Die Chronik des Ibn Ijās*, iv (ed. Paul Kahle and Muḥammad Muştafā), Leipzig-Istanbul 1931; v, 2nd ed. (ed. Mohamed Mostafa), Wiesbaden-Cairo 1961, 3-102 (tr. G. Wiet, *Journal d'un bourgeois du Caire*, i, ii, 1-94, Paris 1955, 1960); Muḥammad b. Tūlūn al-Şālīhī al-Dimashkī, *Islām al-warā* (ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Duhmān), Damascus 1383/1964, tr. Henri Laoust, *Les gouverneurs de Damas sous les Mamlouks et les premiers Ottomans*, Damascus 1952, 77-143; Nadīm al-Dīn al-Ghazzī, *al-Kawākib al-sāʾira bi-aʿyān al-miʿa al-ʿūshira* (ed. Djabrāʾil Sulaymān Djabbur), Beirut 1945, i, 294-7; Kuṭb al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Nahrawālī al-Makkī, *al-Barq al-Yamānī fī ʿl-faḥ al-ʿUṭhmānī*, in *Ghazawāt al-Djarākisa wa ʿl-Atrāk fī djanūb al-Djazira*, Riyād 1387/1967, 16-27; D. Ayalon, *Gunpowder and firearms in the Mamluk kingdom*, London 1956; R. B. Serjeant, *The Portuguese off the south Arabian coast*, Oxford 1963.

(P. M. HOLT)

**KANSU**, a province in the north-west of China, bounded in the south and east by the provinces of Szechwan and Shensi and in the west and north by the province of Chinghai and the Sinkiang Uighur and Inner Mongolia Autonomous Regions. The province, first formed under the Great Khan Kūbilāy in 1282 A.D., received its name from the towns in the extreme north-west, Kanchou (Changyeh) and

Suchou (Kiuchuan); both towns are already mentioned in the *Hudūd al-ʿālam* and Gardīzī, the former in the form Khāmdjū (in the Mongol period Kamdjū) and the latter as Sukhdjū or Sūkdjū.

1. *To the end of the Mongol period.* Until the thirteenth century A.D. this territory was for the most part under the domination of foreign peoples of Turkish (Uyghur) or Tibetan (Tangut) origin; immediately before the Mongol conquest there was a Tangut kingdom here under the Hsai (or Hsi-hsia) dynasty (1032-1227) with their capital at Ningsia (Yinchuan). Rashīd al-Dīn, in giving a list of the twelve provinces (*shing*, Chinese *shêng*) of China, divides the Tangut region into two, with Kīndjanfū (now Sien, the capital of Shensi) and Kamdjū (Kanchou) as their respective capitals. In actual fact, Kanchow was the capital of Kansu; Kansu and Shenn were then, as later, combined in a single government, the only difference being that the residence of the governor was then in the capital of Shensi and not, as later, in the capital of Kansu. The boundary between Kansu and Shensi was formed by the Hwang Ho, so that Lanchou, the present-day capital of Kansu, then belonged to Shensi. In connection with Quengianfu (*i.e.*, Kīndjanfū, Sian) Marco Polo mentions Prince Mangalay (d. 1280, the Mangqalā of Rashīd al-Dīn) Kūbilāy's third son, as ruler of Tangut, while Rashīd al-Dīn refers to his son Ananda; according to Rashīd al-Dīn, he was the founder of Muslim dominance in this area. Born about 1270 (at the beginning of the 14th century he was thirty years of age), he was brought up by Muslim foster-parents; but it was only after the conversion of the Il-Khān Ghazan (*i.e.*, ca. 1295) that he openly professed Islam. He converted the greater part of his army, numbering nearly 150,000 men to Islam, and the people of Tangut, except the peasantry, were likewise converted. Taken to task by his cousin the Great Khān Temūr Öldjeytū (1294-1307) for his conversion, Ananda remained faithful to Islam and after a period of interruption was restored to his dominion. In 1307 a party wished to raise him to the throne of the Khānate, but he was put to death after the success of a rival candidate, Temūr's nephew Khayshān (1307-1311). It was not until 1323 that Ananda's son Örüg-Temūr was appointed prince of Tangut.

As Marco Polo shows, there were already Muslims in Kansu before Ananda's time; however, he says nothing about the dissemination of Islam south of the Hwang Ho. The Turkish-speaking Salar, who live at the present day on the southern banks of that river, are mentioned as living there as early as the Ming dynasty (1368-1644) and described as unruly subjects, although no Muslim risings are recorded during this period. The story which reached Tīmūr's territories about 1398 to the effect that the founder of the Ming dynasty had ordered the massacre of some 100,000 Muslims and had completely eradicated Islam in China finds no confirmation in any Chinese source.

*Bibliography:* *Hudūd al-ʿālam*, 85, 232; Rashīd al-Dīn, ed. Blochet, 484-98, 595-602; *The Successors of Genghis Khan*, tr. J. A. Boyle, New York and London 1971, 281-3, 323-6; Waṣṣāf, *Tahrīr-i Taʾrikh-i Waṣṣāf*, ed. ʿAbd al-Muḥammad Āyatī, Tehran 1346/1967, 279-81; Marco Polo, ed. Yule and Cordier, i, 203, 319, ii, 24; V. V. Barthold, *Four Studies on the History of Central Asia*, ii (*Ulugh-beg*), Leiden 1958, 49-50; P. Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo*, s.v. Campcio. (J. A. BOYLE)

2. *In the post-Mongol period.* After the collapse of the Yüan dynasty which took place in 770/1368,

Muslims in Kansu, as well as those of other provinces of China, were put under the rule of the newly-established Ming dynasty, which, at the beginning of the new régime, adopted a discriminatory attitude against non-Chinese. It oppressed *Hui-hui* or Muslims, and generally speaking, the *Hui-hui* under the Yüan dynasty were obliged to settle in China, and began to be assimilated to the Chinese way of life through intermarriage with native Chinese women. They were physically and linguistically sinicised as time went by; *Hui-hui* under the Ming dynasty gradually changed their original, Islamic surnames to Chinese ones (e.g., from Muḥammad to Ma, etc.), and adopted Chinese languages; nevertheless, they adhered strictly to Islam. This process also affected Kansu Muslims, with some characteristics different from those of China proper.

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

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

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

The size of the Chinese Muslim population in Kansu is unclear: M. Broomhall (1910) estimated it at two or three millions. According to the statistics of the government of the Chinese Peoples' Republic, the Muslim population of Kansu is estimated at 1,086,597 (30% of the total population of Kansu Province in 1953), and that of Chinghai at 257,959; thus the total population is 1,330,000. The basis of Broomhall's estimate is not clear, but, as compared with the present situation, these seem to be acceptable statistics. Generally speaking, Kansu Muslims are more densely distributed in the southern part of Kansu, that is, south of the Yellow River.

Islam in Kansu as in other provinces of China,

is that of the Hanafi rite, with some influence from the Shāfi'i one, as is shown by investigations of D'Ollone on Islamic legal practices prevalent in modern Kansu (D'Ollone, *Recherches sur les Musulmans chinois*).

The most important feature among the Muslims of Kansu is the prevalence of Sūfism, apparently originating in the middle of the 18th century. In contemporary Ch'ing sources, one of the Sūfi teachings of Kansu Islam is called *Hsin-chiao* (the "New Sect" or "New Teaching"), which was reported for the first time in 1761 immediately after the Ch'ing conquest of Eastern Turkistan. One Ma Ming-hsin, a native of Anting, Kansu, started to spread the so-called "New Teaching" in the district of the Salar tribes in Hsining after his return in 1761 from a period of religious study at Yarkand and Kāshghar in Eastern Turkistan. With the support of Sū-ssū-shih-san and Hu-ma-liu-hu, both Salar *mullas*, he founded the "New Sect" in 1762. This propagated a mystical ritualism characterized by: (1) loud chanting of religious songs, as opposed to the low chanting by the Old Sect or Old Teaching; (2) prayers with head-shaking and body movement in a dance-like manner—foot-stamping, hand-waving, and face turning up towards heaven; (3) belief in miracles, visions, apparition of spirits and prediction of good or bad omens; and (4) worship of Muslim saints and their tombs. Ma Ming-hsin was revered as the saintly founder of the sect. However, one cannot consider the "New Sect" founded by Ma Ming-hsin as a reform movement reacting against the traditional sects, generally called Ancient or Old Sects (*K'u-pai*, *Chiu-pai* and *K'u-hsing-pai*).

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

In 1862 a new revolt broke out at Chin-chi-pao, where Ma Hua-lung who came from the direct "apostolic" line of Ma Ming-hsin, maintained his quarters. Ma Hua-lung is reported to have been a mystical saint who was able to perform miracles; but his rebellion was suppressed in 1871 by the Ch'ing army. The mystic order of Ma Hua-lung was called *Djahriyya* from the 19th century onwards (D'Ollone); the headship of the Order passed to Ma Yüan-ch'ang, a disciple of Ma Hua-lung, who had his headquarters at Chang-chia-chüan, Kansu. Ma Yüan-ch'ang is mentioned by G. Andrew who visited him in the early 20th century; he died in 1920 during an earthquake which occurred in Kansu during that year.

Besides *Hsin-chiao*, another characteristic of the Sūfism of Kansu Islam is the institution of *mêng-kuan*. *Mêng-kuan*, especially the Four Great *Mêng-kuan*, was reported in Ch'ing sources for the first time in 1786; the Six Great *Mêng-kuan* were also reported in 1943. They are (1) the *Hu-fei-yeh* sect, including *Pi-chia-ch'ang kung-pei*, *Lin-p'ao kung-pei*, etc.; (2) the *Ka-ti-lin-yeh* sect, including *Ta-kung-pei*, *Yang-men*, etc.; (3) the *K'u-pu-lin-yeh* sect; (4) the *Sha tsü-lin-yeh* sect; (5) the *Sai-ai-lo-wo-lo-ting-yeh* sect; and (6) the *Che-ho-lin-yeh* *Djahriyya* sect.

According to the missionary D'Ollone, who made a study of aboriginal peoples in the borderlands of China in 1906-9, the tombs of three Islamic saints were revered among Kansu Muslims. Mêng-kuan adherents were also called *Kung-pei-chiao*, that is, "followers of Tomb Teaching". Thus, the *Djahriyya* sect of Kansu Muslims may be said to be one of *meng-kuan*, tomb-worshippers.

*Bibliography*: P. Dabry de Thiersant, *Le mahométisme en Chine et dans le Turkestan oriental*, Paris 1878; M. Broomhall, *Islam in China: a neglected problem*, London 1920; D'Ollone, *Recherches sur les musulmans chinois. Études de A. Vissière, notes de E. Blochet et de divers savants*, Paris 1911; G. F. Andrew, *Crescent in Northwest China*, London 1921; R. B. Ekvall, *Cultural relations of the Kansu-Tibetan border*, Chicago 1939; J. Trippner, *Islamische Gruppen und Gräberkult in Northwest-China*, in *WI*, vii (1961), 142-171; N. N. Čeboksarova, (ed.), *Narody Vostočnoj Azii*, Moscow-Leningrad 1965; Immanuel C. Y. Hsü, *The Ili crisis: a study of Sino-Russian diplomacy 1871-1881*, Oxford 1965; Wen-djang Chu, *The Moslem rebellion in Northwest China 1862-1878: a study of government minority policy*, The Hague-Paris 1966; M. Sushanbo, *Dungane (istoriko-etnografičeskij ocerk)*, Frunze 1971; T. Saguchi, *An ethnic history of the Ch'ing-hai Salars*, in *Tarih Araştırmalar Dergisi*, vii, no. 10-11 (Ankara 1972), 225-30; T. Saguchi, *Jūhachi-jūkyūsciki Higashi Torukisutan shakaishi kenkyū* ("The social history of Eastern Turkistan in the 18th and 19th centuries"), Tokyo 1963; K. Tazaka, *Chūgoku ni okeru kaikyō no denrai to sono gulsū* ("Islam in China: its introduction and development"), Tokyo 1964. (T. SAGUCHI)

**KANȚARA**, pl. *kanāṭir*, means in Arabic (1) bridge, particularly a bridge of masonry or stone, one of the most famous of which is that of Sandja [q.v.]; also (2) aqueduct (especially in the plural), dam, and finally (3) high building, castle (similarly *kasātil* = aqueduct from *kastal* = castellum; see *KANĀT*); cf. *TA*, iii, 509; Dozy, *Supplément*, ii, 412; de Goeje, *BGA*, iv, 334; and particularly R. Geyer in the *SB Ak. Wien*, cxlix/6 (1905), 114-9. The original meaning of the word "arch, stone archway", is found in the earliest Arabic lexicographers; cf. Dozy-de Goeje, *Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne par Edrisi*, 369, *Djīsr* [q.v.], a bridge of wood or boats, is the opposite of *kanȥara*, which is of stone; in time, however, the two words came to be used as synonyms (see Dozy, *Suppl.*, i, 194).

No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the origin of the word. The oldest reference is found in a verse of Ṭarafa (iv, 22; see *The Diwans of the six ancient Arabic poets*, ed. Ahlwardt, 1870, 55). On account of this early occurrence of the word, Yāḳūt (iv, 187) considers the word to be genuine Arabic. But we may with considerable certainty regard it as a loan-word. Vollers and Geyer thought that it was borrowed from Latin or Greek. The former connected (*ZDMG*, li, 376; *ZA*, viii, 100-1) *kanȥara* with the mediaeval Latin word *cintrum* (French *cintré*, arch, vault), while Geyer (*op. cit.*, 118-9) sought the original either in *καυθήλος* = basket, *cantherius* = wickerwork used in the making of roofs and buildings, or in *κάμπτρα*, *κάμπτριον* = depository (cf. also *καμπτής* = rounding, curve), from which Vollers (*ZDMG*, li, 302) derived Egypto-Arab. *kimȥar*. But all these explanations are to be rejected, because there are phonetic objections to them and they partly rely for the meanings of the words cited on obsolete, farfetched glosses; cf. for objections to

these explanations, Fränkel in *ZA*, xix, 270-1, and Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, 408. *Kanȥara* is most probably to be derived from the Aramaic, and, as Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, thinks, in the first place from *ḫeṣārā* = hoop, arch (see Payne-Smith, *Thesaur. Syriac.*, col. 3591; note specially *ḫeṣārā* in Bar Bahlūl, *Lexic.*, col. 1768). The above-mentioned word *djīsr* also comes from the Aramaic (Fränkel, *Die aram. Fremdwörter im Arab.*, Leiden 1886, 285 and D. H. Müller in *WZKM*, i, 31), but can actually be traced back to the Assyrian or Accadian (cf. Meissner in *ZA*, ix, 269, and Ziminern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter*, Leipzig 1915, 31).

Al-*Kanȥara* has survived in Spanish in the diminutives *alcantarilla* = little bridge, gutter and *alcantarillado* = arched aqueduct; see Dozy-Engelmann, *Glossaire des mots espagnols et portugais dérivés de l'arabe*<sup>2</sup>, Leiden 1869, 47; *Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana por la Real Academia Espanola*, xiii, Madrid 1899, svv; J. Oliver Asin, *Historia del nombre Madrid*, Madrid 1959, index.

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

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

1. An oasis on the southern slopes of the Atlas in Algeria at the exit of a narrow pass through which run the road and railway from Constantine to the desert regions; it is a station on the Constantine-Biskra line, 35 miles north of the latter. This, the most northern oasis in Africa, consists of three villages with about 3,500 inhabitants and possesses a very dense date grove. From its situation it was an important military station and, as Roman inscriptions found there show, settled in ancient times. It is presumably identical with the station *Ad Calcem Herculis* of the Roman itineraries (see Dessau in Pauly-Wissowa, iii, 1345). The name al-*Kanȥara* is derived from the Roman bridge, restored in 1862 by the French, which spans in one huge arch the ravine, the 150 feet wide Fumm al-Ṣahārā = the mouth of the Ṣahārā (so-called by the inhabitants), through which flows the Wād al-*Kanȥara* (cf., for example, Vivien de St. Martin, *Dict. de Géographie Universelle*, Paris 1879, i, 66 and Kobelt, *Reiseerinnerungen aus Algerien und Tunis*, 1883, 322).

2. Alcántara, a little town of great antiquity in the province of Cáceres (district of Estremadura) in Spain, near the Portuguese frontier, with 3,200 inhabitants. It receives its name from an imposing granite bridge, built in 105 A.D., which crosses the Tagus in six great arches to the northwest of the town. The place is also famous for the religious knightly order founded there in 1176 to defend the frontier against the Moors, which became called the Order of Alcántara after its headquarters were moved to this town in 1213 (see Baedeker's *Spain and Portugal*<sup>4</sup>, Leipzig 1912, 459).

3. A small town with a mosque in Egypt, on the Asiatic side of the Suez canal, half-way between Port Ṣa'īd and Ismā'īliyya, a station on the railway connecting these two towns. It lies on a low narrow

several mistakes. Following the information of Ahmed Wefik (*op. cit.*), who mentions Karā Hişār as the chief place of a *nāhiye* of the *kadā'* of Serik in the *sandjak* of Adalia, and the information of Ewliyā Çelebi (*Seyāhatnāmesi*, ix, 290) according to which the place was built at the foot of a mountain called Serek dağı, Mordtmann in *EI*<sup>1</sup> and Besim Darkot in *IA* have sought to identify it with the large village of Serik, a real centre of a *kadā'* in the plain between the Aksu and the Köprü Su, nearer to this last river. This identification of the locality is incompatible with the data of the same text of Ewliyā, which place it to the west of the Aksu, four hours' journey from Antalya and an hour to the north of the village of Kundu (still existing) on the one hand, and on the other with the information of the same, as well as of al-Kalkashandī (*Şubh*, v, 346), which places it on a lofty hill. Süleyman Fikri Erten (*Antalya vilayeti tarihi*, Istanbul 1940, 90) wished incorrectly to place it at the ancient town of Sillyon, a hypothesis compatible with the data on the elevated site but not with the information on distance and placing in relation to the river. In fact, there is no doubt that it can be identified with the ancient town of Pergum in terms of the above characteristics. Recognized since the 19th century by Krause in his articles *Pamphylia* and *Perge* in the *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, Sect. 3, vol. x (1838), 244, and vol. xv-xvi (1841), 435, but without comment and information on sources, then by X. de Planhol (*De la plaine pamphylienne aux lacs pisidiens*, Paris 1958, 105, 123), it has been set out clearly in detail by Barbara Fleming (*Landschaftsgeschichte von Pamphylien, Pisidien und Lykien im Spätmittelalter*, Wiesbaden 1964, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, xxxv/1, 101-2; see equally the index, s.v. for the numerous mentions of this town).

7. DEVELI KARĀ HIŞAR, i.e., the Karahişār of Develü (*develeniñ Karāhişāri* in Neshrī, *ZDMG*, xv, 341, and Leunclavius, *Hist. Musulm.*, 334); also named after the district of Develü (Houtsma, *Recueil*, iii, 104) to distinguish it from other towns of the same name. This town, situated in Asia Minor, 45 km. to the south-west of Kayşariyye, is already frequently mentioned in the history of the Saldjūkids (Houtsma, *Recueil*, iv, *passim*). It belonged afterwards to the possessions of the Banū Eretnā (cf. Max van Berchem, *Matériaux*, Pt. 3, 41 and 48), then to that of the Karāmān-oghulları and was conquered in 794/1391 by Bāyazid I (Neshrī, *loc. cit.*); at the time of the conquest of Karāmān by Mehemmed II in 879/1474, it surrendered to the Ottomans (Sa'd al-Dīn, i, 550). At the end of the 17th century, the district of Develi Karā Hişār formed a *kadā'* dependent on Kayşariyye (*Djihānumā*, 620). The town then declined, without doubt due to the insalubrity of the swamps (Sultan Sazlığı) which extend to the approaches of the town, and the consequence of this was the transfer of the centre of the *kadā'* to Develi (or Everek), to the south of Kayseri and 40 km. to the east, whereas Karā Hişār, at the end of the 19th century, was no more than a *nāhiye* of the *kadā'* of Indjesu. This transfer has been at the source of a whole series of confusions between the two towns (Ahmed Wefik, *Lehdje*, 580, and Cuinet, *Turquie d'Asie*, i, 304, 320, give information which is quite obscure and false). The town, established anew as a *kaza* in 1946, took the name of Yeşil Hisar. Of the ancient fortifications of Develi Karā Hişār, only insignificant fragments remain; the town, known for its fruit production, is situated at the foot of some hills, in the midst of extensive gardens (Kinneir, *Journey*, 109; Hamilton, ii, 284).

There were several hundred houses at the end of the last century, with an increase to 5,800 inhabitants in 1950. In the neighbourhood of Develi Karā Hişār, 3 km. to the south-west, are the ruins of Zindjibar Kal'esi, considered formerly to be the ancient Nora (W. F. Ainsworth, *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*, London 1842, i, 210) and now identified with Cyzustra (W. M. Calder and G. E. Bean, *A classical map of Asia Minor*, London 1958).

*Bibliography*: Apart from the works already cited, I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr and N. Beldiceanu, *Deux villes de l'Anatolie pre-ottomane, Develi et Qarahisar, d'après des documents inédits*, in *REI*, xxxix (1971), 337-86.

8. KARĀ HIŞAR in the land of 'Uthmān (Yāqut, iv, 45): perhaps this is meant to be the Karadja Hişār, also named Karadja Şehir, near İnönü in the territory of origin of the Ottoman Sultans, a place which is often described even in the ancient chronicles by the name of Karā Hişār.

9. KARĀ HIŞAR, in the territory of Ibn Torghut (Ibn Faḍl Allāh, *op. cit.*, 350); this is, however, impossible to identify, unless it is an ancient name for Torghudlu Kaşabaşl near Mānisa.

10. KARĀ HIŞAR, *chef-lieu* of the *kadā'* of Na'lu-khān (Nallihan), *vilāyet* of Ankara (Ahmed Wefik, *op. cit.*). One encounters several villages of this name in the boundaries of the said *kaza*.

11. HAMMĀM KARĀ HIŞAR, village of the *nāhiye* of Günyünzī, *kadā'* of Sivri Hişār, *vilāyet* of Eskişehir, 17 km. to the east of the *chef-lieu* of the *kaza*.

12. VĀN KARĀHIŞARI (Ewliyā, *op. cit.*, iv, 275-6), which the traveller visited on the route from Van to Kotur, and of which he says that the Kurds call it Karadja Kale; this is today a village of the *kaza* of Saray (newly called Özalp).

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

(J. H. MORDTMANN-[X. DE PLANHOL])

KARĀ KALPAK [see KARAKALPAK].

KARĀ KHALİL [see DJANDARLI].

KARĀ-KHĀNIDS [see ILEK-KHĀNS].

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

In the Orkhon inscriptions of Outer Mongolia, the royal annals of the T'u-chüeh or Turks (ca. 732 A.D.), the Kitai are mentioned as enemies of the Turks and as living to the east of the Turkish heartland on the Orkhon and Selenga rivers. Ethnically and linguistically, the Kitai were most probably Mongols rather than Tungus, as some earlier orientalist surmised, though there is a possibility that they spoke a language of their own, unrelated to the above two groups (see the discussions in Wittfogel and Fêng, *History of Chinese society: Liao*, 21-3, and Sir Gerard Clauson, *Turk, Mongol, Tungus*, in *Asia Major*, N.S. viii (1960), 120-1, 123). There must also have been considerable Uyghur Turkish influence on them when they were subject to the Kaghans of the Eastern Turks.

In Chinese sources, the Kitai are first called the Ch'i-tan (K'i-tan) and then, after 947, the Liao. In

the period of chaos after the downfall of the T'ang dynasty (907), the expansionist Kitai overran northern China and established there a ruling dynasty which, whilst retaining its basic steppe ethos, became at least superficially sinicized, so that Chinese annals account them a native dynasty; southern China, on the other hand, remained in the hands of the indigenous Sung dynasty (960-1279). The Liao empire stretched from the Pacific in the east to the Altai mountains and the Uyghur lands in the west, and their original name of Kitai, in the form *Khitā* or *Khatā*, was applied by the Muslims to northern China, whence older English Cathay, Russian Kitay, Greek Kitaia, etc. for the whole country of China (see Sir Henry Yule, *Cathay and the way thither*, London 1913-16, i, 146; in Muslim usage *Čin*, Arabic form *Šin* [*q.v.*] became the term reserved for southern China).

Between 1116 and 1123, however, the Liao of northern China were overthrown by a fresh wave of barbarian invaders from the north, the Tungusic Jürchen of the Amur-Ussuri basin and northern Manchuria, who formed the Chin ("golden") dynasty, Mongol Altun Khans. A part of the Kitai remained in China with the Chin and later, in the time of Čingiz Khān, were able successfully to rebel and restore the Kitai kingdom as a Mongol vassal state. Muslim sources mention raids westwards by the "Khitāy" on Islamic territories adjoining the Semirečye during the 5th/11th century (see Ibn al-Athīr, ix, 209-10, incursion of the *Khitāy* in 408/1017-18), but these attacks may well have been made by Mongol groups, perhaps the Nayman, pushed westwards by the expansion of the Kitai proper in northern China (see Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale*, 95). It was the migration of ca. 519/1125 and thereafter by the Ḳarā ("black") *Khitāy* (in the Latin of John of Plano Carpini, 1246, *nigri Kitai*), Chinese Hsi ("western") Liao, which was really significant for the eastern Islamic world. One more southerly group moved into eastern Turkestan, but came up against the branch of Ilek Khānids or Ḳarakhānids [*q.v.*] ruling in Kāshgharia. Arslan Khān Aḥmad b. Ḥasan defeated them before they could reach Kāshghar and captured their leader. Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 55, places this battle in 522/1128, which is perhaps too early, since in a letter from the Saldjūq sultan of eastern Persia, Sandjar, to the caliph's vizier, dated 527/1133, the victory is described as a recent event.

The adventures of the other group of *Khitāy* are described by Djuwaynī, tr. Boyle, i, 354 ff. It may be that we should regard these merely as the right wing of a general Ḳarā *Khitāy* advance along a broad front, successful in breaking through where the left wing thrust into Kāshgharia failed. At all events, this second group came westwards by a more northerly route, through the Kirghiz lands on the upper Yenisei, building the settlement of Emil to the east of Lake Balkhash, which they used as a base for intervening in the Ḳarakhānid principality in the Semirečye. By this time, their numbers had swollen to 40,000 tents. The Ḳarakhānid ruler tried to win the *Khitāy* over as allies against his own unruly Ḳarluq and Ḳanghli tribesmen, but instead found himself deposed. The Ḳarā *Khitāy* leader, whose name appears in Chinese sources as Yeh-lü Ta-shih (d. 537/1143) now, after a half-hearted attempt to organize a revanche and regain the Liao homeland in China, made the town of Balāsāghūn [*q.v.*] in the Ču valley his base for a series of attacks on the surrounding Turkish tribes and principalities:

against the Kirghiz and Ḳanghli in the steppes, and against the Ḳarakhānids in Khotan and Kāshghar, where Ibrāhīm b. Arslan Khān Aḥmad probably died in battle against them. In 536/1137 Maḥmūd Khān b. Arslan Muḥammad of Samarkand was defeated at Khudjand in Farghāna.

After the Ḳarā *Khitāy* had halted for four years, internal disputes in the Samarkand Khānate laid open the whole of Transoxania to them. Nomadic Ḳarluq tribesmen at odds with Maḥmūd Khān appealed to the Ḳarā *Khitāy* against their overlord. Maḥmūd had recourse to his own suzerain Sandjar, and the Saldjūq sultan now invaded Transoxania from Khurāsān with a large army. In Šafar 536/September 1141 a bloody battle was fought at the Ḳaṭwān Steppe in Ushrūsana to the south of the middle Syr Daryā. Despite a probable numerical superiority, the Muslims were routed with huge losses, and Sandjar and Maḥmūd Khān abandoned Transoxania and fled to Khurāsān; this clash between the conventionally organized Muslim army and the Ḳarā *Khitāy* nomadic horde was, indeed, a foretaste of what was to happen when Čingiz Khān's Mongols appeared in the Islamic lands. The Ḳarā *Khitāy* now occupied Samarkand and Bukhārā, and Yeh-lü Ta-shih sent an army against Khwārazm, compelling the Khwārazm-Shāh Atsiz [*q.v.*] to pay an annual tribute of 30,000 *dīnārs*. The lands under Ḳarā *Khitāy* control came to stretch from the borders of the Kirghiz country in the north to Balkh in the south (occupied in 560/1165), and from Khwārazm in the west to the Uyghur lands of eastern Turkestan (see the maps in A. Herrmann, *An historical atlas of China*, Edinburgh 1966, 38-40, and Wittfogel and Fêng, *op. cit.*, 658). The news of the Ḳarā *Khitāy* victory over the Muslim forces at the Ḳaṭwān Steppe filtered through to the Crusaders in the Levant and thence to Christian Europe, giving fresh impetus to the legends about Prester John, the powerful Christian monarch who supposedly ruled in Inner Asia and who was attacking the Muslims from the rear (that these legends were in circulation before this time is suggested by C. F. Beckingham, *The achievements of Prester John*, Inaugural Lecture, University of London 1966).

The Ḳarā *Khitāy* leaders are called in the Islamic sources by the title *Gür-Khān*, and the personal names of the successive rulers are known only in their Chinese forms (see below). Djuwaynī, tr. i, 354, and Djuzdjānī, *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāsirī*, ed. Ḥabībī, ii, 96, tr. Raverty, ii, 911, explain that *Gür-Khān* means "Supreme Khān", *Khān-i Khānān*; Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale*, 97, n. 1, connected the first element with the old Turkish word *kür*, *kül*, "noble, courageous", found in names and titles of the Orkhon inscriptions, giving something like "Heroic Khān".

Pace Barthold's categorical assertion that "The Qara-Khitay kingdom was vastly different from the usual type of nomad empires" (*Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, i, 29), the Ḳarā *Khitāy* empire was in many ways typical of the steppe empires established by a Eurasian steppe confederation, despite the partial sinicization of the Ḳarā *Khitāy* themselves. It is probable that, like all nomadic confederations, they were not an ethnically homogeneous group; the successes of the first *Gür-Khān* doubtless attracted numbers of Turks, Tanguts and perhaps even Tungus to swell the original core of the Kitai. They were a military aristocracy of cavalrymen, spread thinly over the lands which they dominated, but with their main concentration at the *Gür-Khān's* ordu or army camp outside Balāsāghūn



in the Semirečye. The Chinese history of the dynasty, the *Liao Shih* (completed in 1344), mentions a census taken in 546/1151 by the Gür-Khān Yi-lieh. This enumerated 84,500 households with adult males in them, but this figure probably included the indigenous Muslim population of Balāsāghūn and its hinterland as well as the Karā Khitāy tribesmen; even reckoning two fighting men per household, the numbers of the Karā Khitāy cannot have been all that large (see Wittfogel and Fêng, 659-60).

Nor was there any administrative centralization, despite the fact that they did not follow the practice in other nomadic empires of granting out appanages to relatives and others of high rank; the first Gür-Khān is said not to have entrusted to any man command of more than 100 warriors. Except in Balāsāghūn, where, as noted above, the local Karā Khānid ruler was displaced (although the population of the town remained largely Muslim), local dynasties continued elsewhere to exist as the Gür-Khāns' vassals. In some places, there were appointed permanent representatives of the Gür-Khān (Chinese *chien-kuo* "state supervisor", Turkish *baskak*, Arabic-Persian *shahna*) side-by-side with the local ruler; a province like Khwārazm was only visited periodically by the Karā Khitāy tribute-collectors; whilst at the beginning of the 7th/13th century the *šads* or religious leaders in Bukhārā of the Burhān family (on whom see O. Pritsak, *Āl-i Burhān*, in *Isl.*, xxx (1952), 81-96) took the tribute of the city in person to the Gür-Khān's *ordu*, just as later under the Golden Horde the prince of Muscovy took his tribute to the capital at Sarāy.

The Karā Khitāy administration was therefore primarily a fiscal one, and beyond the collection of taxes, the subject territories were left largely to their local rulers. Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 56, says that the Gür-Khān imposed a tax of one *dīnār* per annum on each household of the conquered peoples, but we know that tribute in kind was also collected. Barthold thought that the *dīnār* levy on each family was a specifically Chinese feature, but it seems to have been only one method followed amongst several in a far-from-uniform system; one Chinese source says that the rural populace around Balāsāghūn paid a tithe on their crops to the Gür-Khān. The Gür-Khāns coined their own copper currency on the Liao and Chinese pattern, with the regnal period inscribed in Chinese characters, but the vassal states continued to mint their own Islamic-type coins, and as we have just seen, the unit of the *dīnār* was recognised by the Karā Khitāy for tax-collecting purposes (see Wittfogel and Fêng, 661-2, 664, 672-3).

Barthold also asserted in his *EP* article KARĀ KHITĀY that the "language of the government seems to have been Chinese", but the linguistic and cultural structure of Central Asia at this time was complex and reflected the *mélange* of races, cultures and faiths to be found there. The Karā Khitāy undeniably set a Chinese imprint on the administration and culture of the lands under their control, and Muslim authors noted a few Chinese words like *fu-ma* "imperial son-in-law" for the Gür-Khān's son-in-law (Djuwayni-Boyle, i, 290, 292) and *pāyza*, Chinese *p'ai-tzū*, "tablet, insignia of a government official's authority" (*ibid.*, i, 158; 'Awfi, *Lubāb al-albāb*, ed. Browne, ii, 385). The Gür-Khāns bestowed Chinese official titles and used the Chinese script for solemn decrees, but the number of Chinese litterati at their *ordu* can never have been very large. They must have called upon Muslim scholars and secretaries for their correspondence in Persian and the Arabic script with

their Muslim vassals, and probably upon Uyghur officials for correspondence in Turkish and the Uyghur script with vassals in eastern Turkestan.

The Karā Khitāy never adopted Islam, as did eventually the Mongol Khāns in the Islamic world, but they displayed the traditional tolerance of the steppes towards all faiths. Even though Islam was especially identified with the resistance in Transoxania by the Karakhānids and by Sandjar, they did not systematically persecute Muslims, as did their brief supplanter Küclüg (see below) in Kāshgharia. A contemporary Muslim author like Nizāmī 'Arūḍī Samarqandī gives an anecdote about the first Gür-Khān's boundless justice, his deference to the *Ṣudūr* of Bukhārā and his removal of an oppressive representative of the Karā Khitāy administration there (*Čahār maḳāla*, ed. Browne, 24, revised tr. 24-5). Djuzdžānī, the historian of the Ghūrids, is also remarkably enthusiastic about them; he praises the first Gür-Khān for his just rule and respect for Muslim sensibilities, and even purveys a tale that one of the later Gür-Khāns had secretly become a Muslim (*Tabakāt-i Nāsiri*, ii, 96, tr. 911-12). Muslims retained leading positions in the Karā Khitāy administration; the wealthy merchant Mahmūd Tay is mentioned by Djuwaynī, tr. i, 357-8, as being vizier to the last Gür-Khān.

However, the religious tolerance and impartiality of the Karā Khitāy undoubtedly permitted adherents of non-Islamic faiths to flourish more openly in Turkestan than under the orthodox Muslim Karakhānids. A great period of missionary activity and enterprise opened for the Nestorian Christian Church in Inner Asia; the patriarch Elias III (1176-90) founded a metropolitan see in Kāshghar whose jurisdiction also included the Semirečye; and the oldest of the Syriac-inscribed Christian gravestones from the Ču valley in the Semirečye stem from this period (see Barthold, *Zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel-Asien bis zur mongolischen Eroberung*, Tübingen-Leipzig 1901, 57 ff.; *idem*, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale*, 99-101; the earliest inscription published by Chwolson dates from 1186). There were Chinese artisans working in Samarkand at this time, and the Jewish communities in Khīwa, Samarkand, etc. were flourishing, according to the evidence of a Jewish traveller in Persia like Benjamin of Tudela (see W. J. Fischel, *The Jews of Central Asia (Khorasan) in mediæval Hebrew and Islamic literature*, in *Historia Judaica*, vii (1945), 29-50). Grousset commented with some justice that "the foundation of the Qara Khitay empire may be viewed as a reaction against the work of Islamization accomplished by the Qarakhanids" (*L'Empire des steppes*, Paris 1952, 221).

As for the Karā Khitāys' own religion, we can glean very little from the sources. Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 55, calls the first Gür-Khān a Manichaean. Muslim writers usually, however, simply call them "idolaters", but we may surmise that Buddhism, which had overlaid the original shamanism of the Ch'i-tan in China, was widespread amongst them.

One may accordingly say that the receptiveness of the Karā Khitāy environment to differing cultural and religious traditions, and the consequent encouragement of the flowering of these traditions under the dynasty's relaxed rule, constitutes a certain achievement in human civilization, one which anticipates the better side of the succeeding *pax mongolica*. Thus the Chinese connections of the Karā Khitāy probably facilitated the journeyings of Muslim traders into Mongolia and perhaps even as far as northern China. Acts of violence and oppression towards the subject

peoples can never have been wholly absent, and these may have increased towards the end of their rule. Yet our admittedly fragmentary knowledge of the trends of the period allows us to go some way with Marquart's approbation of Ḳarā Khīṭāy culture (*Über das Volkstum der Komänen*, 209), and to regard Barthold's dismissal of the achievements of the dynasty as negligible (*Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale*, 98-9) as unduly harsh.

The chronology of the line of Ḳarā Khīṭāy Gür-Khāns can be pieced together from the *Liao Shih* and from odd items of information in the Islamic sources (e.g., the recording by Ibn al-Aṭhīr, xi, 57, of the first Gür-Khān's death in Rajab 537/Jan.-Feb. 1143). In his standard *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam*, Zambaur made no attempt to deal with the Ḳarā Khīṭāy, although Marquart, *op. cit.*, 237-8, had given a substantially correct list of their rulers. After the death of the original Gür-Khān Yeh-lü Ta-shih (1124-43), his widow T'a-pu-yen (named in *Djuwaynī-Boyle*, i, 356, as Kuyan, honorific title Kan-t'ien, regnal title Hsien-ch'ing) reigned 1144-50. There succeeded the Gür-Khān Yi-lieh, regnal title Shao-hsing (1151-63); and finally the last Gür-Khān, Yi-lieh's younger son Chih-lu-ku (1178-1211, d. 1213). The fact that the Ḳarā Khīṭāy dominions were ruled by women for two out of these five reigns is significant evidence for the matriarchal trend in Ḳarā Khīṭāy society; in China proper, the Liao empress-dowagers had traditionally wielded great influence in the state. See on these questions of chronology, Wittfogel and Fêng, 620-1, 627 ff.; 672.

The Kh̄wārazm-shāhs from Il Arslan (551/1156 567/1172) onwards endeavoured at various times to throw off the yoke of the Ḳarā Khīṭāy, but their withholdings of tribute were normally followed by Ḳarā Khīṭāy invasions which re-asserted their overlordship. The Shāh Tekish (567/1172-596/1200) owed his throne to the help of the Gür-Khān Yeh-lü's son-in-law Fuma, but he later renounced his allegiance, adducing the oppressiveness of the Ḳarā Khīṭāy tax-collectors and raising the banner of *djihād* against the infidels; in the words of Ibn al-Aṭhīr, xi, 248, he rebelled "out of zeal for the dignity of his throne and for the faith". The Ḳarā Khīṭāy in turn now supported Tekish's younger brother and earlier rival for the throne, Sultān Shāh, and helped him to seize several towns in northern Khurāsān (576/1181). In the last decades of the 6th/12th century and the opening years of the 7th/13th century, the Ḳarā Khīṭāy aided Tekish and his son and successor 'Alā' Al-Dīn Muḥammad in their rivalry with the Ghūrids of Afghānistān [*q.v.*]; thus in 594/1198 the Gür-Khān sent an army across the Oxus to recover the vassal city of Balkh from the Ghūrids; the Ḳarā Khīṭāy were, however, defeated, and this led to recriminations between them and the Kh̄wārazm-Shāh.

After his eventual crushing of the Ghūrids, 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad had ambitions to extend Kh̄wārazmian control over the whole of Transoxania and to reduce the last vestiges of Ḳarakhānid rule there. This necessarily involved clashing with the Ḳarā Khīṭāy suzerains of the province. A general revolt flared up in eastern Turkestan amongst the Gür-Khāns' Muslim vassals, and it was on the crest of these disorders that the Nayman Mongol Küçlüg rose to power there after his flight westwards before Čingiz Khān [*q.v.*]. The last Ḳarakhānid ruler in Samarqand, 'Uṭhmān Khān b. Ibrāhīm (600/1204-608/1212), attempted to throw off Ḳarā Khīṭāy

control, offended by the Gür-Khān's refusal to grant him the hand of a daughter in marriage; but he had his capital temporarily occupied by a Ḳarā Khīṭāy force (probably in 606/1209-10), and the marriage in fact later took place. 'Uṭhmān Khān then allied with the Kh̄wārazm-Shāh to defeat the Ḳarā Khīṭāy near Talas in 607/1210, and although the Gür-Khān defeated Küçlüg, the appearance of a Mongol force under Čingiz's general Ḳubilay Noyan compelled him to come to terms with Küçlüg (608/1211) and to surrender; he remained as nominal ruler only, and died two years later. Thus for a brief while, before the arrival of Čingiz in the west, the Ḳarā Khīṭāy dominions were partitioned between the fiercely anti-Muslim Küçlüg in Kāshgharia and the Semirečye, and the Kh̄wārazm-Shāh in Transoxania. The remaining members of the Ḳarā Khīṭāy horde must have been caught up in the armies of the Mongols.

However, their rule was perpetuated indirectly in one corner of the eastern Islamic world. Shortly after the collapse of 608/1211, one of the Ḳarā Khīṭāy commanders called Barak Hād̄jib entered the service of the Kh̄wārazm-Shāhs and eventually founded the principality of the Ḳutluḡ-Khānids in Kirmān; see BURĀK HĀDJIB, Zambaur, *Manuel*, 237, and Wittfogel and Fêng, 626, 655-7.

*Bibliography:* The chief Muslim sources include Ibn al-Aṭhīr, *Djuwaynī* and the standard Saldjūk sources (e.g., Rāwandī, Bundārī) for the establishment of Ḳarā Khīṭāy power in Transoxania, and *Djuwaynī* again and *Djūzdjānī* for the later phases. Some of the relevant Chinese sources were translated in E. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval researches from eastern Asiatic sources*, London 1910, i, 208-35, but the Chinese sources are utilized directly by K. A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-Shêng, *History of Chinese society: Liao (907-1125)*, in *Trans. American Philisophical Society*, N.S. xxxvi (Philadelphia 1946), 619-74.

For other secondary sources, see W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*<sup>3</sup>, 323 ff.; idem, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale*, 94-101; idem, *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, i. *A short history of Turkestan*, 26-30, *History of the Semirechyé* 100-8; J. Marquart, *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*, 2. *Über das Volkstum der Komänen*, in *Abh. Gött. Gesell. der Wiss.*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., N.S. xiii/1 (1914); R. Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*<sup>4</sup>, 219-22; C. E. Bosworth, in *Cambridge history of Iran*, v, 147-50, 187 ff. (C. E. BOSWORTH)

ḲARĀ KIRGIZ [see KIRGIZ].

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

The best-known lake is that lying at the western extremity of the Zarafshān River in Soghdia (modern Uzbekistan), midway between Bukhārā and Čardjūy (mediaeval Āmul-i Shaṭṭ, see ĀMUL. 2). The basin in which it lay was known as the Sāmdjān basin, see Iṣṭakhrī, 315, and Ibn Hawḳal, ed. Kramers, 485, tr. Kramers and Wiet, 466. In Narshakhī's *Ta'rikh-i Bukhārā*, ed. Schefer, 17, tr. Frye, 19, the lake is given both the Turkish name of Ḳarā-Köl and the Iranian one of Bārgin-farākh "extensive basin", and is said to have been 20 *farsakhs* long by one *farsakh* wide.

In history, this lake has been identified with the *ḳara köl* mentioned in the Old Turkish Orkhon inscriptions (8th century), Kültigin N 2, where it is described as the scene of a battle between the Tiukiu or Eastern Turks under the prince Kültigin and the rebellious Az people (possibly the Türgesh), cf.

Khīwa (1226/1811) the Karakalpak too had to submit to the Khān of Khīwa. They made frequent attempts to throw off this yoke; in 1827 they even captured and held the town of Kungrat for a time. After the suppression of this uprising, a body of them migrated to Farghāna. In 1855 the leader of the rebel Karakalpak, Ir-Nazar-bī, adopted the title of Khān, building a fortress near where the Qazaq river flows into the Aral Sea.

After the Russian conquest of Khīwa in 1873, when the Khān had to cede to Russia all his possessions east of the main arm of the Amū Daryā and the most north-westerly arm of its delta, the land of the Karakalpak became Russian. The area, then separated from Khīwa, was first administered as a separate department (*otdyel*), and later as part of the "government" of Sīr Daryā. On 11 May 1925 the Karakalpak Autonomous Oblast was formed as part of the Qazaq A.S.S.R.; on 20 March 1932 its status was changed to an Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (A.S.S.R.); and on 5 December 1936 this A.S.S.R. was transferred to the Uzbek S.S.R.. The capital of the Karakalpak A.S.S.R. is Nukus. The Karakalpak, who at the time of the Revolution were on the verge of being totally assimilated by the Qazaq (and to a lesser extent by the Uzbek), were preserved as a distinct group by the Soviet régime. Linguistically the Karakalpak language is merely a dialect of Qazaq; their tribal divisions are the same as that of the Qazaq. Karakalpak was first written (*i.e.*, established as a literary language) in 1925 using the Arabic script; in 1928 this was changed to a Latin script; and since 1940 it has been written in Cyrillic. The 1970 Soviet census lists 236,009 Karakalpaks in the U.S.S.R. Of these 230,258 (97.6 %) live in the Uzbek S.S.R.; and of these latter, 217,505 (92.2 % of the total Soviet Karakalpak population) live in the Karakalpak A.S.S.R., 8,668 in Bukhāra Oblast, 1,428 in Tashkent, and 732 in Farghāna Oblast (the Farghāna Karakalpaks are rapidly being assimilated by the Uzbek).

*Bibliography*: Vambéry, *Das Türkenvolk in seinen ethnologischen und ethnographischen Beziehungen*, Leipzig 1885, 373; S. A. Tokarev, *Etnografīya Narodov S.S.S.R.*, Moscow Univ., 1958; *Narodī Sredney Azii i Kazakhstana*, Academy of Sciences, Moscow 1962, i. For their language: K. H. Menges, in *PhTF*, i, 434-88 (*bibl.* at p. 438), and cf. ii, 761. (W. BARTHOLD-[R. WIXMAN])

**KARAKAY**. The cross-reference to this from CARUCUEL is erroneous; see QARĀ-KÖL, QARĀKUL.

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

In the Ottoman Empire the maintenance of security and order in different quarters of Istanbul was entrusted mainly to the Janissaries [see YEŪ-ĀERİ], and the *ortas* (companies) patrolling the city were called *kulluk*. During the military campaigns, apart from the *çarkhadji* (vanguard) forces, the Ottoman army used to send out small units called *karāvul müfrezeleri*. In the same way the Ottoman navy, when at sea, sent out two mail ships as *karāvul sefineleri*, with the task of preventing any sudden

attack on the fleet. About ten ships under the command of the *tersâne ketkhudası* (Intendant of the Admiralty) brought up the rear as *ard karāvul* to help ships in trouble when necessary.

After the suppression of the Janissaries in 1826, public security in Istanbul became the responsibility of the *ser'asker* [*q.v.*]; an autonomous administration, the *Ḍabliyye Müshiriyyeti*, which was founded in 1846 to take charge of police functions, was changed into a *nezāret* (ministry) in 1870 and in 1909 attached to the Ministry of the Interior as a directorate with authority extending over the whole country [see ḌABTIYYA]. At that time, a police-station was called *karakol-khāne*, and later *karakol*. The word *karakol* was used also in the Turkish army and navy to designate a unit charged with security or observation duty (*istinād karakolu*, *ileri karakol*, *nizām karakolu*, etc.).

*Bibliography*: Sh. Sāmī, *Kāmūs-i türki*, Istanbul 1317, s.v.; Kātib Çelebi, *Tuhfat al-kibār fī asfār al-bihār*, Istanbul 1329, 148; M. D'Ohsson, *Tableau général de l'Empire ottoman*, Paris 1824, vii, 348; İ. Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı devleti teşkilâtından Kapıkulu ocakları*, Ankara 1943, i, index; see also İA, s.v. (by R. Rahmeti Arat).

(E. KURAN)

**KARAKOL DJEM'İYYETİ**, a secret society founded in Istanbul towards the end of 1918 by a group of former members of the Union and Progress Committee [see İTTİHĀD WE TERAQKĪ DJEM'İYYETİ]. Its aim was to organize guerilla resistance bands against the Allied forces which had occupied strategic points in Turkey following the armistice of Mudros on 30 October 1918. After the organization of the Nationalist Movement in Anatolia under the leadership of Muşafā Kemāl Pasha, the Karakol society supplied the movement with intelligence, officers and arms. The society tried to gain control over the nationalists of Anatolia, and Qarā Wāşif, one of the founding members, became their representative in Istanbul. However, Muşafā Kemāl succeeded in checking the activities of the Karakol society and ordered its dissolution in the spring of 1920, on the grounds that a delegate of the society had signed a pact of military assistance with the Bolsheviks on 10 January 1920 without the authorization of the nationalists. Nevertheless, the Karakol society seems to have continued its underground activities until the end of the Turkish War of Independence.

*Bibliography*: Kemal Atatürk, *Nutuk*, Istanbul 1934, i, index; Ali Fuad Cebesoy, *Milli Mücadele hâtıraları*, Istanbul 1953, 347 ff.; Kâzım Karabekir, *İstiklâl harbimiz*, Istanbul 1960, 509, 628 ff.; Tarık Z. Tunaya, *Türkiyede siyasî partiler*, Istanbul 1952, 520 ff.; Muharrem Giray, *İstanbul'un işgalinde gizli bir teşkilât, Karakol Cemiyeti*, in *Yakın Tarihimiz*, Istanbul 1962, i, 345 f.; George S. Harris, *The origins of communism in Turkey*, Stanford, Cal. 1967, index; A. A. Cruickshank, *The Young Turk challenge in postwar Turkey*, in *MEJ*, xxii (1968), 18 f. (E. KURAN)

**KARAKORUM** (QARAKORAM), a chain of mountains in the centre of Asia lying north of and almost parallel to the Himalayas. The range extends westwards as far as 73° long.; it has not yet been definitely ascertained how far it runs eastwards. At one time the eastern limit was thought to be the pass of the Karakorum, the plateau of Depsong and the upper part of the Shayok, but, according to the views of several famous geographers, the range runs much farther into Tibet, and the Tang-la (to the north of upper Saluën) should, they think, be re-

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

The highest elevations are found in the part west of the pass of Karakorum. There we find several peaks over 8,000 m. high and countless summits over 7,000 m. The highest peak—probably the second highest in the world—is K 2, which seems to have been long known as Chogo-ri among the natives. This giant attains a height of 8,611 m.

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

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

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

The principal pass is the col of Karakorum (5,574 m.), through which runs the important trade route between Chinese Turkestan and Kashmir. It is difficult and dangerous. In their long journey countless beasts of burden perish of exhaustion or in the avalanches. The mountains take their name from the pass. But as Karakorum means "black debris", the name is not very appropriate. It is found for the first time in a map by Elphinstone published in 1815. On this map the range in question is indicated by the name Moor Taugh (instead of Mur Tagh, "Ice Mountain") or Karrakoorum Mountains.

The first traveller to write on the mountains now called Karakorum was Mirzā Haydar Dughlāt, à propos of his journey from Yarkand to Leh, capital of Ladakh, in 960/1553. The exploration proper of the Karakorum only began in 1808 when Elphinstone visited these regions. The more systematic and detailed exploration of the high mountains proper was only begun in 1892 by Sir Martin Conway's expedition, which was followed by many others (including 5 expeditions of Ph. C. and J. Visser between 1922 and 1935).

*Bibliography:* M. Elphinstone, *An Account of the Kingdom of Caubul*, London, 1815; H. von Schlagintweit, *Reisen in Indien und Hochasien*; Jena, 1871; F. von Richthofen, *China*, Berlin 1877; Georg Wegener, *Versuch einer Orographie des Kwen-lun*, Marburg 1891; F. Grenard, *Mission scientifique dans la Haute Asie*, Paris 1890-95, 1898; Martin Conway, *Climbing and Exploration in the Karakoram-Himalayas*, London 1894; J. L. Dutreuil de Rhins, *Mission Scientifique dans la Haute Asie*, Paris 1897; S. G. Burrard and

H. H. Hayden, *A sketch of the Geography and Geology of the Himalaya Mountains and Tibet*, London 1907; F. B. and W. H. Workman, *Ice-bound Heights of Mustagh*, London 1908; idem, *Two Summers in the Ice-wilds of Eastern Karakorum*, London 1917; F. Frech, *Aus der Vorzeit der Erde*, Leipzig 1911; Filippo de Fillippi, *Karakoram and Western Himalaya* 1904, London 1912; A. Neve, *Thirty Years in Kashmir*, London 1913; Jacot Guillarmod, *Six mois dans l'Himalaya, le Karakorum et l'Hindu-Kush*; Ph. C. Visser, *Naar Himalaya en Kara-korum*, Rotterdam 1923; idem, *Zwischen Kabul und Hindukusch*, Leipzig 1928; idem, *Wissenschaftl. Ergebnisse des Niederländ. Expeditionen in den Karakorum*, Leipzig 1935-8; E. Trinkler and H. de Terra, *Wiss. Ergebnisse der Trinklerschen Zentralasien-Expedition*, 2 vols., Berlin 1932; K. Mason, *Above the snow—a History of Himalayan exploration and mountaineering*, London 1953; G. O. Dührenfurth, *Himalaya-Chronik*, 1953-68; H. J. Scheider, *Die deutsche Karakorum-Expedition 1959*, in *Berge der Welt*, 1960-61; A. Gansser, *Geology of the Himalayas*, London 1964; *The Himalayan Journal* (annually since 1929).

(PH. C. VISSER-B. SPULER)

**KARAKORUM**, a town in the *aymak* of Övöi Khangay in Central Mongolia, now in ruins; in the 7th/13th century it was for a short time the capital of the Mongol World Empire. The fullest accounts of the town are given by the European traveller William of Rubruck and the Persian historian Djuwaynī [q.v.]. The ruins were first discovered in 1889 by N. M. Yadrentsev; they were visited and described by the members of the Russian expedition of 1891 led by Radlov; and in 1948-49 an expedition jointly organized by the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic investigated the palace of the Great Khān Ögedey, the handicraft workshops at the crossroads of the main thoroughfares of Karakorum and some places near the southern gate of the town. Though walled by Ögedey only in 1235, Karakorum had been chosen by Čingiz-Khān as his capital as early as 1220. The name, which is Turkish and means "black boulder", was, as Djuwaynī expressly remarks, originally applied to the mountain region around the sources of the Orkhon. According to William of Rubruck, the city of Karakorum, exclusive of Ögedey's palace, was "not as big as the village of Saint Denis", while the monastery of Saint Denis was "ten times larger than the palace". There was, however, much building in Karakorum during its brief period of splendour, and William of Rubruck as well as Djuwaynī give full descriptions of the imperial palaces built in the city and around it, some by Chinese and others by Muslim architects. According to the European traveller, Russian and Western European craftsmen also shared in these operations. To the east of Karakorum, in a village called Tuzghu-Balik (from the Turkish *tuzghu*, "offering of food to a traveller", and *balik* "town") built in 1238, there was a palace with the Chinese name of Ying chia tien ("Welcome Carriage Hall").

After the Mongol emperors had removed their residence to China, Karakorum was only the seat of the governor of Mongolia. It changed hands temporarily during the long war with Kaydu, but generally remained in the possession of the emperor. When the Mongol dynasty was expelled from China (1368), the emperors returned to Karakorum, but after the extinction of the dynasty in the 15th

perhaps less of a defeat for the Ottoman Empire than has been commonly accepted, and the Ottomans were able to withdraw from a disastrous war with their pride, if not their territories, intact. Within governing circles of the Empire the settlement nonetheless was to generate considerable opposition, particularly from military elements, and it is probably in these internal repercussions, leading up to the Edirne Incident of 1115/1703, as much as in the actual territorial adjustments, that its significance lies.

*Bibliography:* Ewliyā Çelebî, *Seyāhatnâme*, vii (Istanbul 1928), 144-5. Mehmed Rāshid, *Tārīkh*<sup>2</sup> (Istanbul 1282), ii, 415-74 (texts of treaties at pp. 449-73; western-language versions were published in *Flugschriften* soon after the conclusion of the congress, in Vienna, Venice and elsewhere; cf. also R. Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes*<sup>6</sup>, iii, London 1700, *ad finem*, for the first English edition of the treaties). For important Ottoman works still in MS. form, cf. the references given in the article by İ. Parmaksızoğlu, s.v. *Karlofça*, in *İA*. The account by J. von Hammer, *GOR*, vi (Pest, 1828), 636-78, is based in part on these, and is still useful on that account. The studies on the Congress of Carlowicz by Popovic (1893) and Munson (1940) are now superseded; the results of recent research by R. A. Abou-El-Haj are to be found in his unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Princeton 1963) and in articles in *JAOS*, lxxxvii/4 (1967) and lxxxix/3 (1963), and *Islam*, li/1 (1974).

(C. J. HEYWOOD)

**KARLUK**, early Arabic form *Kharlukh*, Persian *Khallukh* (whence frequent confusion in the sources with the *Khaladj* [q.v.], Chinese Ko-lo-lu (north-western Middle Chinese \*Kār-lā-luk), a Turkish tribal group in Central Asia. They were originally a small federation of three tribes (whence the name given to them in the Uyghur Shine-usu inscription ca. 760 of Uč Karlık; the *Hudūd al-‘ālam*, 98, on the other hand, mentions seven tribes of the Karluk), and comparatively unimportant. Their paramount chief never bore the title of *khaghan* or *khan*, but in the 7th and 8th centuries had that of *ēlleber* (perhaps "possessor of a land or people"), one of only moderate rank (see A. Bombaci, *On the ancient Turkic title Ellēbār*, in *Proceedings of the IXth meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*, Naples 1970, 24, 57-8), and *Kāshgharī* does not mention them amongst the twenty Turkish tribes listed in the introduction of the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* (tr. Atalay, i, 28). *Kāshgharī* does, however, mention the Karluk in connection with certain Turkish words or phrases, and defines them as a nomadic tribe, distinct from the Oghuz, but, like them, counted as Turkmen (tr. i, 473, cf. Barthold, *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, iii, *A history of the Turkman people*, 78).

Our first information on the Karluk comes from Chinese sources, which mention them as having been subjugated by the Western T'u-chüeh or Turks ca. 640-50. At this time they were a pastoralist people located on the upper reaches of the Irtysh River and north of the T'ien Shan. In the early years of the 8th century they passed under the control of the Eastern T'u-chüeh empire, and the Orkhon inscriptions mention the rebellion of the Karluk against the *Khaghan* in 711-14 (see Sir Gerard Clauson and E. Tryjarski, *The inscription at Ikhē Khushotu*, in *RO*, xxxiv/1 (1971), 27-8, 29). The Karluk took part with the Basml and Uyghur in the general upheaval which brought about the disintegration of the Eastern T'u-chüeh empire (743-5), but were in turn defeated by the Uyghur and compelled to move westwards to-

wards Transoxania (on all these events, see E. Chavaignes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*, St. Petersburg 1900; Liu Mau-tsai, *Die chinesische Nachrichten zur Geschichte der Ost-Türken (T'u-kiie)*, Wiesbaden 1958; L. N. Gumilev, *Drevnie Tyurki*, Moscow 1957; J. R. Hamilton, *Les Ouigours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties*, Paris 1955).

They now come within the orbit of Muslim writers. According to *Iṣṭakhrī*, 290, the boundary between the Karluk and the Oghuz was the region of *Isfidjāb* on the middle Syr Darya, and the *Hudūd al-‘ālam* (372/982), 97, cf. Map v, 279, places them south of the Issik-Köl, i.e., on the southern fringes of the Semireçye. Their ruler now appears in Muslim sources with the title of *yabghu* (Arabic form *djabbūya*, probably reflecting a western Turkish dialectical pronunciation of the word), adopted equally by the chief of the Oghuz [see *GHUZZ*]. There were also Karluk who had penetrated southwestwards into the upper Oxus basin and *Ṭukhāristān*, where Arabic sources mention them in connection with the Arab campaigns against the epigoni of the Hephthalites in this region; the prince of the Karluk here also bore the title of *yabghu*.

These Karluk on the northern fringes of Transoxania were long a refuge for political and religious dissidents and refugees fleeing before the Arab advance into Central Asia; thus the *Yabghu*, together with the local Soghdians and the ruler of Tibet, supported the rebellious Arab governor in Samarkand, Rāfi' b. Layth, against the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd. Such contacts, however, probably disposed the Karluk to reception of the Islamic faith and culture, whereas the more westerly Oghuz remained at a perceptibly lower cultural level. The campaign of the Sāmānid Amīr Ismā'īl b. Aḥmad [q.v.] against Talas in 280/893 struck into the heart of their lands, and commercial and religious penetration must have followed; the geographers of the 4th/10th century mention the existence of mosques in several towns east of Talas. The comparatively advanced state of the Karluk at this time is reflected in the statement of the *Hudūd al-‘ālam* that they were a pleasant-natured people, near to civilized folk in their living standards; the same source describes several of their settlements in the southern part of the Semireçye where some of the Karluk practiced agriculture and whither merchants resorted (97-8, 286 ff.).

The royal family of the *Karakhānides*, who put an end to the Sāmānid amirate in Transoxania at the close of the 4th/10th century and divided its lands with the *Ghaznavids*, may conceivably have sprung from the Karluk (this thesis is maintained by O. Pritsak, *Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden*, in *ZDMG*, ci (1951), 270-300); but equally possible candidates are such groups as the *Çigil*, *Yaghma*, *Türgesh*, etc., and it is strange that *Kāshgharī*, who sprang from the *Karakhānid* milieu, does not mention a Karluk origin for the dynasty [see *ILEK-KHĀNS*]. Some Karluk tribesmen certainly remained as a nomadic tribal group within the *Karakhānid* dominions, for in the 6th/12th century we hear of tension between them and the *Karakhānid khāns*; it was the pretext of help for the Karluk at odds with *Çaghri Khān* of Samarkand which enabled the *Kh'ārazm-Shāh* II Arslan to invade Transoxania in 553/1158 (see *Djuwaynī-Boyle*, i, 288-9; *Bosworth*, in *Cambridge history of Iran*, v, 148-9, 187-8).

At the opening of the 7th/13th century there were Karluk rulers in the region to the north of the Ili River and eastwards from their earlier centre in the southern Semireçye, e.g., in *Almaligh* and *Kayaligh*,

where these *Khāns* were under the suzerainty of the *Qara Khitāy* [q.v.] (Djuwaynī-Boyle, i, 74-5; Barthold, *Four studies . . . i. History of the Semirechye*, 103-4). Karluk tribal contingents joined the army of Čingiz-Khān in 616/1219 and took part in the invasion of Transoxania, but after the Mongol period, the name of the Karluk becomes less frequent in the history of Central Asia, without ever disappearing completely. Thus the *Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī* of Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥaydar Duḡlāt, tr. Elias and Ross, 309, mentions a commander (*sirdār*) of the Karluk tribe in Transoxania involved in warfare of the early 9th/15th century. At the present time, various Turkish groups of northeastern Afghānistān, in the regions of Badakhshān and Kattaghān, call themselves Qaluk or Karluk; see G. Jarring, *On the distribution of Turk tribes in Afghanistan, an attempt at a preliminary classification*, in *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*, N.F. xxxv/4 (Lund-Leipzig 1939), 71-3 and index.

*Bibliography*: In addition to works cited above, see Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*<sup>3</sup>, index; idem, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, chs. iii-v; Bosworth, *The Turks in the Islamic lands up to the mid-11th century*, in *PhTF*, iii, Wiesbaden 1970; *IA* art. *Karluqlar* (Rahmeti Arat). The information of the Islamic geographers is utilized in Minorsky's copious commentary to the section on the Karluk in *Hudūd al-'ālam*, 97-8, 286-97. (C. E. BOSWORTH)

KARM(A.), the vine. To one who knows the official attitude of Islam towards wine [see *KHAMR*], the vitality of the cultivation of the vine in the majority of mediaeval Muslim countries may appear paradoxical. Nevertheless, it is incontestable, and is explained by the force of tradition in some countries where the vine has long been established, by the multiple uses of the grape (fresh fruit, dried raisin, vinegar, pharmaceutical uses, the lees as fertilizer, etc.), by the survival of non-Muslim communities, and also by the laxity of many Muslims themselves. This vitality is attested in particular, perhaps due to the written tradition, by the very considerable and exceptional place that the Muslim agronomists accord to the vine in comparison with the other species studied, from the easterner Ibn Waḥshīyya or the *Calendar of Cordova* to the Andalusians of the 5th/11th and the 6th/12th centuries, to whom we owe the essential part of that which will be summarized below. Their knowledge resulted from the combination of the data of the ancient authors, rediscovered and assimilated (with, in Spain, Junius = Columella added to the sources known in the Orient) with the intensive day-to-day experience constantly renewed.

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

etc.) mainly made use of the diversities of the climates and soils of the Mediterranean zone and the Near East.

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

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

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

Among the measures taken to increase the vine's productivity, pruning (*sabr*) was the principle practised in winter with the iron pruning knife (*mindjal*) already described by Columella; the aim was to draw the sap towards the best developed wood. Grafting, already known to the ancients, was the subject of descriptions and experiments infinitely more varied among the Muslim agronomists. Everything was taken into consideration, form and colour of the

of the act of unveiling". Al-Ghazālī's famous distinction between *'ulūm al-mu'āmalā* (ritual observances, social customs and ethical rules) and *'ulūm al-mukāshafa*, by means of which realities are apprehended, is well-known. The *Ihyā'*, i, 18, says that the *'ilm al-mukāshafa* is the knowledge of what is concealed (*bāṭin*), and is the aim of all the sciences. It is the science of the saints (*ṣiddīkūn*) and those "brought near to God". It is a light which shines into the heart if the latter is purified and freed from its reprehensible qualities, a light which bears upon God, His essence, His angels, His acts, the prophets and the future life (cf. *ibid.*, i, 48). It is not argumentation, nor simple acceptance, but an intuitive and sure grasping of the subject. "By *'ilm al-mukāshafa*, we mean the pulling-aside of the veil so that the Real One shows Himself in all his splendour; and this is effected with a clarity which sets the object present right before the eyes, without any possible grounds for doubt" (i, 18; see other references in Jabre, *op. cit.*, 246, and *idem*, *La notion de certitude selon Ghazālī*, Paris 1958, index, s.v.). *Mukāshafāt* and *mukāshaf* appear equally all through the *Ihyā'*.

Hence for al-Ghazālī, *kashf* is a light, a freely-bestowed grace from God, which at the same time alone bestows its quality of certain knowledge. In so far as the later *'ilm al-kalām* was open to influences from al-Ghazālī (or directly from Ṣūfism), *kashf* and *mukāshafa* were sometimes freely accepted; but the most classic treatises hardly ever refer to them.

3. *Brief references in Shī'ism.* In Shī'ism, the spiritual experience of *kashf* inevitably came to form a theological (or "theosophical") dimension. The apprehension of the "hidden meaning" (*bāṭin*), which is the perfection of Islam and which is the prerogative of the great Imāms, led to a high value being placed on *kashf*. To give only one significant example, the two treatises of the Imāmī Sayyid Ḥaydar Āmulī, ed. Henry Corbin and Osman Yahya as *La philosophie shī'ite* (Tehran-Paris 1969), deal with *kashf* as a manner and a method of knowledge. The *Djāmi' al-asrār* mentions it, after *wahy* (revelation though angelic intermediacy) and *ilhām* (divine, interior inspiration), as a participation stemming from the universal intellect and the universal soul (*La philosophie shī'ite*, 448-53). When Āmulī defines *kashf* (*ibid.*, 462), it is in the same lexicographical and technical terms as were to be copied from him by al-Djurdjānī, as already mentioned above. The ending of the chapter distinguishes, among other things, (a) *kashf suwārī* (the "imaginal" perception of reality) whose irradiations (*tadjiyyāt*) reach the senses of sight and hearing; mention is made in this connection of the master Ibn 'Arabī; and (b) *kashf ma'nawī*, which is of the spiritual order (*rūhī*); the text emphasises strongly *mukāshafāt* received in this fashion (*ibid.*, 464-72). In his *Risāla . . . fī ma'rifat al-wudjūd*, Āmulī enumerates three modes of knowledge: by the intellect (*'akl*), by transmission (*naql*) and by *kashf* (*ibid.*, 623), and only the last one leads to the apprehension of Reality.

Hence it is with some justification that, in regard to Ḥaydar Āmulī, the phrase "the method of *kashf*" has been used (cf. Peter Antes, *Zur Theologie der Schī'a*, Freiburg 1971, 49, 68), this method being an intuitive one in which certainty is sought from spiritual illumination. Āmulī's admiration for Ibn 'Arabī and for the latter's deliberate scheme for "reconciling" the Ṣūfīs and the Imāmīs, is well-known. Āmulī's work was to influence all later

Twelver theology, and is in fact the applying of the Ṣūfī *kashf* to the Shī'ī search for the hidden meanings of things. If we bear in mind that his definition of *kashf* was adopted as it stood by the Sunnī al-Djurdjānī, we can accordingly discern, despite the divergencies of various climates of thought, a continuity of viewpoint.

Ismā'īlī writings put the accent on the idea of the "state" of *kashf* from a double point of view, both gnostic and cosmic. The title chosen by al-Hudjwīrī in the 5th/11th century, *Kashf al-mahdūb*, designates equally the 8th/14th century treatise of the Ismā'īlī scholar Abū Ya'qūb al-Sidjīstānī, and *kashf* now introduces an ontology and cosmology of gnostic type. Furthermore, the classic opposition or *mukābal* of *kashf-satr* is frequently found, this time set forth according to wide cosmic perspectives, in the Ismā'īlī cycles of metahistory. The *aeon* of "proto-history" (Corbin) and of post-history are unfolded according to alternate phases of "unveiling" ("epiphany", as tr. Corbin) and "occultation". The length of these cycles may vary, and may refer indifferently to the "preordial Adam" (the "Perfect Man"), to the "partial Adam" (the Qur'ānic Adam) or to the "spiritual Adam" for the intelligible realities. According to al-Husayn b. 'Alī, a Yemenī *dā'i* of the 6th/12th century, the cycle of unveiling (*dawr al-kashf*) is 50,000 years, and the cycle of occultation (*dawr al-satr*) is seven millenia. The present age, since the creation of the "partial Adam", is the fourth millenium of a cycle of occultation, which has been preceded and will be succeeded by a cycle of unveiling (cf. al-Husayn b. 'Alī, *Risālat al-mabda' wa'l-ma'ād*, ed. and Fr. tr. Corbin, *Trilogie ismailienne*, Tehran-Paris 1961, 121-3/181-3).

An exhaustive study of *kashf* in Shī'ī thought—Imāmī and Ismā'īlī—would in fact require an extensive exposition.

*Bibliography*: given in the article.

(L. GARDET)

**KĀSHGHAR**, a town in Chinese Turkestan (Sin Kiang); the same name is still used in Chinese official documents. The name *Kāshghar* first appears in Chinese transcription (K'iu-cha) in the *T'ang-shu*; cf. E. Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-Kiue (Turcs) occidentaux*, St. Petersburg 1903, 121 f. On the pre-Islamic *Kāshghar* and the ruins of Buddhist buildings in the vicinity, see A. Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, Oxford 1907, i, 52 f.; *idem*, *Serindia*, Oxford 1921, 80 f. Arab armies did not reach *Kāshghar*; the story of Kutayba's campaign in 96/715 is, as shown by H. A. R. Gibb in *BSOS*, ii (1923), 467-8, a mere legend. Since ca. 132/750, *Kāshghar* was under Karluq rule and turkicized by them. On the flight of a prince of Farghāna to *Kāshghar* in the time of the Caliph al-Manṣūr (136-58/754-75) see the article **FARGHĀNA**. In the Sāmānid period a *Dihkān* of *Kāshghar* with the name or title *Tughān Tigīn* is mentioned (Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 37), with whom the rebel prince Ilyās b. Ishāq took refuge; whether this *Dihkān* had already adopted Islam is not mentioned. At a later date Satuk Boghrā *Khān* is mentioned as the first Muslim *Khān* of *Kāshghar*; in the oldest reference to him that we have (*Djamāl Qurashī* in Barthold, *Turkestan*<sup>3</sup>, 255, 257) the date of his death is given as 344/955-6. This story already contains features which are certainly legendary; in the story of the building of the first mosque we have the well-known folklore motif of the cutting of an ox-skin into strips. The later legend, reproduced by F. Grenard (*JA*, Ser. 9, vol. xv, 1 f.), has not this feature but

contains many other legendary traits and absolutely false dates. The year 344 A.H. is perhaps too early, as probably the story of the adoption of Islam by a numerous Turkish people (200,000 tents) in 349/960 must be referred to the Turks of Kāshghar; this story is found not only in Ibn al-Athīr (viii, 396) but also in Ibn Miskawayh (*The Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Caliphate*, ed. Margoliouth and Amedroz, Oxford 1921, text, ii, 181, tr. v, 196); the original source is probably Thābit b. Sinān al-Ṣābi' (cf. Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 476, 491; *The Eclipse etc.*, *Index*). The tomb of Satuk Boghrā Khān is in Artūc (now pronounced Artush) north of Kāshghar, where it is still shown.

Under the rule of the Ilig-Khāns [see ILEK-KHĀNS], who confessed Islam since ca. 950, Kāshghar was politically the most important town in the Tarim basin; perhaps it was also the most important from the point of view of culture. In the 5th/11th century there was already in existence a work in Arabic on the history of the town, composed by Abu 'l-Futūh 'Abd al-Ghāfir (or 'Abd al-Ghaffār) b. Husayn al-Alma'ī al-Kādīgharī (*sic*); the author's father, who survived his son (according to al-Sam'ānī by about ten years), died in 486/1093. On father and son and the works of the latter, see al-Sam'ānī, *Kitāb al-Ansāb*, ed. Margoliouth, Leiden-London 1912, ff. 470a, 472a; *Djamāl Kurashī* in Barthold, *Turkestan*, i, 123 f. The rulers—since 1130 under the overlordship of the Karakhitay—were in a special mausoleum (Arabic *al-djumbadha al-khāqāniyya*) on the bank of the Tūmen; the first prince buried there died in Muḥarram 424/Dec. 7 1032-Jan. 5 1033, and the last in Radjab 601/22 Feb.-23 March 1205. During their rule, Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī [*q.v.*] wrote his great Turkish dictionary in Baghdād, and Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥadjib his *Kutadghu bilig* in Kāshghar. During Mongol rule a *madrassa* was built in Kāshghar by Mas'ūd Beg (see BUKHĀRĀ); in its library was the copy of the *Ṣiḥāh* of al-Djawharī used by *Djamāl Kurashī* for his translation (E. Sachau and Éthé, *Cat. of the Persian. . . Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 1889, col. 983). Kāshghar was later under the rule of the Dūghlāt Amīrs [see DUGHĠĀT]; the last of them, Abū Bakr, reigned till 920/1514, according to the statement of his relative Ḥaydar Mīrzā [*q.v.*] for forty-eight years (Mīrzā Ḥaydar Dughlāt, *Ta'rikh-i Rashīdī*, tr. E. Denison Ross, London 1895, 253, 326); but this is contradicted by the author himself, who says that Kāshghar was not conquered by Abū Bakr till 885/1480-1. Abū Bakr is the founder of the modern town. He destroyed the old fortress and in the last years of his reign rebuilt it on a new site, on the other side of the Tūmen on the tongue of land between this river and the Kīzīl Sū (*ibid.*, 286-7, 295).

Under the rule of the "Mongol" Khāns (cf. the *Bibliography* to ČAGHATĀY-KHĀN) and later under that of the Kalmūcks and Chinese (since 1759) the capital of the district was no longer Kāshghar but Yārkand. It was only since the reconquest of the country by the Chinese in 1877 that Kāshghar again attained considerable importance as the residence of the Tao-T'ai, who was over the western and southern part of Chinese Turkestan as far as the oasis of Čerčen, and as the one-time residence of the Russian and English consuls. On Kāshghar in 1873 see H. W. Bellew in Sir T. D. Forsyth, *Mission to Yarkand in 1873*, London 1875. On conditions at the turn of the present century, see especially L. Kornilow, *Kashghariya*, Tashkent 1903 (review by Barthold, in *Zapiski vost. otd. arkh.*

*obšč.*, xv, 131 f.) with plan of Kāshghar on p. 268, and M. Hartmann, *Chinesisch-Turkestan*, Halle a/S. 1908, especially 45 f., 89 f., with a plan of the town from Kornilow. The most important building in Kāshghar and vicinity is Ḥadrat Apāk, the tomb of the famous saint of the 11th/17th century. Kāshghar has now approximately 70,000 inhabitants (mostly Sunni Uyghur Turks).

*Bibliography*: *Hudūd al-'ālam*, 96 (§ 13/1), 280 f.; Yāqūt, ed. Beirut (1957), iv, 430 f.; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Nuzhat al-ḥulūb*, 258; Barthold, *Turkestan*, index; B. Spuler, *Iran*, index; idem, *Geschichte Mittelasiens*, Leiden 1966, index; A. Schultz, in *Mitteilungen aus dem Seminar für Geographie der Univ. Hamburg*, 1921.

(W. BARTHOLD-[B. SPULER])

AL-KĀSHĠGHARĪ, MAḤMŪD B. AL-ḤUSAYN B. MUḤAMMAD, Turkish scholar and lexicographer of the 5th/11th century whose work, the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, is one of the most significant records of the Turkish languages and also an important source for the history of the Turkish peoples. The only information which we possess on his life comes from his own work, and that much is only fragmentary. It seems that he came from Barsghān on the southern shores of the Isik-Köl (cf. *Hudūd al-'ālām*, tr. Minorsky, 98, 292-3), and was born into a noble family connected with the Karā-Khānids [see ILEK-KHĀNS]. Kāshgharī was deeply grounded in Islamic culture and learning, and he himself states that he had travelled extensively and visited many of the Turkish lands before journeying to Baghdād. It may well be that internal conflicts within the Karā-Khānid confederation led him to undertake these travels and to go to Baghdād. In the latter city he mingled with the circles of scholars, and realised that there was a great interest in the Turkish peoples and their languages; hence he was stimulated to compose two works on them. He began to write his *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* in 464/1072. According to the information in the book itself, he wrote four redactions of it during the period 464-76/1075-94). The original of the *Dīwān* is lost, but the unique surviving manuscript, dated 27 Shawwāl 664/1 August 1266, is a good copy, though not entirely free from errors. Kāshgharī's second work, a Turkish grammar called the *K. Djawāhir al-naḥw fi lughāt al-turk*, has been lost, and is known only from the author's own reference to it.

Kāshgharī's work is of particular importance for the Turkic languages, and also for the history, geography and folklore of the Turkish peoples, for this linguistic corpus consists not of coherent texts in one particular Turkic language, but of a comparison-oriented explanatory dictionary and a modest grammatical outline of the language. In fact, it represents the first scholarly approach, and thus the first description of the linguistic material by a particular method, to these languages. At the same time, both in its introduction and in the individual entries, Kāshgharī's work contains a number of facts and remarks—occasionally supported even by personal experience and observation—about the process of the differentiation and spread of Turkic languages, cited in order to elucidate the situation in the 5th/11th century. The information he gives on the writing of Turkic peoples (sc. the Uyghur script) is also useful from a linguistic point of view.

Although he aims at a fairly comprehensive coverage of the Turkic languages, and includes several of them in his dictionary, the linguistic material in the work is primarily a record of the 5th/11th century



Turkish spoken in Kāshghar, which he terms *Khākānī* Turkish. Kāshgharī's work is related essentially to Karakhānid linguistic records. Aside from the material on Kāshghar, the linguistic data from the Oghuz and Kıpçak are of considerable value. The dictionary was originally designed as a language-manual for scholars in Baghdād who had some contact with Turkic peoples. Hence he deliberately adopted the methods of Arabic grammar and lexicography in describing his linguistic material. While Arabic grammar served, to some extent, as a guideline, the products of Arabic lexicographic literature also furnished him with a complete entry-word list, a sort of lexicographic questionnaire, with which he confronted the Turkic word-stock, his own mother-tongue. It is highly probable that this starting point considerably enlarged the word-stock in his work. The fact that the Turkic linguistic material had to be fitted into the categories of Arabic grammar certainly impelled Kāshgharī carefully to study his material. Yet the fact that the work was prepared in Baghdād—at a great distance from the homeland of the Turkic peoples—made him unable to complement and control his linguistic material to the fullest extent; and it is open to question how far he grasped those modest opportunities for such control which were probably available in Baghdād. Also questionable is the extent to which the—assumed—repeated redactions of the work enhanced or diminished the authenticity of the linguistic material. Since we do not possess the autograph manuscript of the work and the copyist was not a Turk, the relation of the copy to the original raises similar questions.

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

Although Kāshgharī's knowledge of the difference between the individual Turkic languages moves within certain objective bounds and his remarks are sometimes contradictory, he must be given credit for using the comparative approach to the full in his work. His main concern is with the language of Kāshghar, the Oghuz and Kıpçak areas; he established as fact the separation of these two

language groups, and the related data may well be considered as the first surviving evidence of them. In the case of certain extinct Turkic languages without any written record, his data are their only documentation.

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

*Bibliography:* 1. Total and partial editions and translations of the *Dīwān*: Maḥmūd b. al-Husayn b. Muḥammad al-Kāshgharī, *Kitāb dīwān-i lughāt al-Turk*, ed. Kilisli Mu'allim Rif'at Bilge, Istanbul 1915-7; B. Atalay, *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk tercümesi*, Ankara 1939-41, see A. B. Taymas, in *TM*, vii-viii (1940-2), 212-52, xi (1954), 75-100; idem, *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk ıfkiyasımı*, Ankara 1941; idem, *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk dizini*, Ankara 1943; D. Dilçin, *Arap alfabesine göre Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk dizini*, Ankara 1957; Maḥmud Koshgariy, *Turkij süzlar devoni (Devonu luğotit turk)*, ed. S. M. Mutallibov, Tashkent 1960-3; G. Abdurakhmonov and S. Mutallibov, *Devonu luğotit turk (Indeksluğat)*, Tashkent 1967; Mutallibov, "Divanü lûgat-it-turk" *Maḥmuda Kashgarskogo (Perevod, kommentarii, issledovanie)*, thesis, Tashkent 1967.

2. Dictionaries including the vocabulary of the *Dīwān*: C. Brockelmann, *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz nach Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī's Divān luyāt al-Turk*, Budapest-Leipzig 1928; idem, *Zu meinem mitteltürkischen Wortschatz. (Eine Erklärung)*, in *KCsA*, ii (1926-32), 390-1; Sir Gerard Clauson, *An etymological dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford 1972; V. M. Nadelyaev et al., *Drevnetjurkskij slovar'*, Leningrad 1969.

3. General works: W. Barthold, *Orta Asya Türk la'rihi hakkında dersler*, Istanbul 1927, 83-5 = *Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, Berlin 1935, 92-5; A. Bombaci, *Storia della letteratura turca*, Milan 1956, 81-106, Fr. tr. *Histoire de la littérature turque*, Paris 1968, 68-76; M. F. Köprülü, *Türk dili ve edebiyatı hakkında araştırmalar*, Istanbul 1934, 33-4; idem, *Çagatay edebiyatı*, in *IA*, Caferoğlu, II. *Türk dili tarihi notları*, i, Istanbul 1943, 42-5; idem, *İlk Türk dilcisi Kāshgarlı Maḥmut*, Ankara 1938; idem, *Kāshgarlı Maḥmut*, Istanbul 1970; idem, *La littérature de l'époque des Karakhanides*, in *Philologiae Turcicae fundamenta*, ii, Wiesbaden 1964, 267-75;

Brockelmann, *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Literatursprachen Mittelasiens*, Leiden 1954; M. Mansuroğlu, *Das Karakhanidische*, in *Philologiae Turcicae fundamenta*, i, Wiesbaden 1959, 87-112; Ülkütaşır, *Büyük Türk dilcisi Kâşgarlı Mahmud*, Ankara 1972 (124-56: detailed bibliography).

4. Studies on various subjects relating to the *Dīwān*: Brockelmann, *Mahmūd al-Kāşgharī Darstellung des türkischen Verbalbaues*, in *KSz*, xviii (1918-9), 29-49; idem, *Allturkestanische Volksweisheit*, in *Ostasiatische Zeitschr.*, viii (1919-20), 50-75; idem, *Mahmūd al-Kāşgharī über die Sprachen und Stämme der Türken im XI. Jahrh.*, in *KCSA* i/1 (1921), 26-40; G. Bergsträsser, *Das Vorbild von Kāşgharī's Dīwān luġāt at-turk*, in *OLZ*, xxiv (1921), 154-5; Brockelmann, *Allturkestanische Volkspoesie* i-ii, in *Asia Major*, i (1923), 1-22, (1924), 24-44; F. Hommel, *Zu den alltürkischen Sprichwörtern*, in *ibid.*, 182-93; Brockelmann, *Naturlaute im Mitteltürkischen*, in *UngJb*, viii (1928), 257-65; idem, *Hofsprache in Allturkestan*, in *Donum natalicum Schrijnen*, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1929, 222-7; A. Z. Valīdī Togan, *Dīwān-ı Luġāt it-Türk'ün telif senesi hakkında*, in *Atsız mecmuası*, ii, no. 16 (1932), 77-8; idem, *Mahmūd Kāşgharī'ye ait notlar*, *ibid.*, ii, no. 17 (1932), 133-6; O. Pritsak, *Karakhanidische Streitfragen 1-4*, in *Oriens*, iii (1950), 210-28; idem, *Mahmūd Kāşgharī kimdir?*, in *TM*, x (1953), 243-6; E. Rossi, *A note to the manuscript of the Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk*, in *Charisteria Orientalia praecipue ad Persiam pertinentia (Joanni Rypka... sacrum)*, Prague 1956, 280-4; L. Bazin, *Les dates de rédaction du "Divan" de Kāşgharī*, in *Acta Or. Hung.*, vii (1957), 21-5; S. Ahally, *Slovar' Makhmuda Kashgarskogo i turkmenskij jazik*, Ashkhabad 1958; T. Banguoğlu, *Kāşghariden notlar: I-III*, in *Türk dili araştırmaları Yıllığı belleten* (1958), 87-113, (1959), 1-26, (1960), 23-48; Kh. Khasanov, *Makhmud Kashgarskij (Žizn' i geograficheskoe nasledie)*, Tashkent 1963; T. A. Borovkova, *Otnositel'no pervogo izdaniya slovarya Makhmuda Kashgarskogo*, in *Narodī Azii i Afriki*, 1964, no. 5, 133-5; idem, *Grammatičeskij očerk yazika "Dīwānu luġāt-it-turk" Mahmūda Kāşgharī*, thesis, Leningrad 1966; K. Czeglédy, *Kāşgharī földrajzi neveihez. Tanulmányok a magyar nyelv életrajza köréből*, Budapest 1964, 60-5; J. M. Kelly, *On defining Dhū ath-Thalāthah and Dhū al-Arba'ah*, in *JAOS*, xci (1971), 132-6; idem, *Remarks on Kāşgharī's phonology. I. Linguistic terminology*, in *UAJb*, xlv (1972), 179-93; Z. Korkmaz, *Kāşgarlı Mahmud ve Oğuz Türkçesi*, in *TD*, xxvii, no. 253 (1972), 3-26; G. G. Musabaev, *Kāşgarlı Mahmud'un yasamı üzerine yeni veriler*, in *ibid.*, 110-20 = *Nekotoriye svedeniya o žizni Makhmuda Kaşghari*, in *Issledovaniya po tyurkologii*, Alma-Ata 1969, 48-62. The Soviet Turcological Journal (*Sovetskaya Tyurkologiya*) has since 1970 contained a large number of articles on the *Dīwān*.

(G. HAZAI)

**KĀSHĪ**, a Persian word designating the tiles or trimmed pieces of faience serving to cover completely or partially the main fabric of buildings in a design principally decorative but also, at times, to protect them against humidity. This term, which also exists in Turkish, is an abbreviation of *Kāshānī*; the town of *Kāshān* [q.v.] was in effect the most important and most famous centre of production in Iran. It appears already in Abū'l-Kāsim, author of the first treatise dedicated to this subject (ca. 700/1300) in the form *kāshī-garī*, which means literally "the art of making the *kāshī*", but for

this author it had a wider sense and designated the art of faience. (See J. W. Allan, *Abū'l-Qāsim's Treatise on ceramics in Iran*, xi (1973), 111-20). In the Arab authors this term becomes *kāshī* (Yāqūt, iv, 15) or *Kāshānī* (Yāqūt, *ibid.*; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, i, 415, 463, ii, 130, 225, 297, iii, 79).

The origin of the *kāshīs* is linked with the techniques of pottery and with that of baked brick. So it has connections with a very ancient art. The excavations of Čughā-Zanbil (Khūzistān) have brought to light several types of dappled tiles (13th century B.C.). (See P. Amiet, *Elam*, Paris 1966, pl. 261). There have also been discovered (*ibid.*, pl. 383-92) some polychrome-coated tiles with zoomorphous decoration at Susa (ca. 8th and 7th centuries B.C.). The famous Frieze of the Archers (Louvre, 5th century B.C.) is a well-known example of the enamelled brick of the Achaemenids (M. Rutten, *Les arts du Moyen Orient ancien*, Paris 1962, pl. xxx) that the Assyrians and Babylonians also knew about (Assyrian Palace of Khorsābād, 722-705 B.C.; Gate of Ishtar at Babylon 6th century B.C.). Later on, in the period of the Parthians and Sāsānids, this art experienced a certain decline and appears to be represented only by mosaics (Bīshāpur, 2nd half of the 3rd century, see R. Ghirshman, *Parthes et Sassanides*, Paris 1962, pls. 180-6).

Moreover, it is this technique which prevailed at the beginning of the Muslim period and the mosaics of this era are of Hellenistic or Byzantine inspiration. They were also much used for floors (rest room of the bath of Khirbat al-Mafḍjar; D. and J. Sourdél, *La civilisation de l'Islam classique*, Paris 1968, pl. 124), as well as on the walls (Dome of the Rock, dated 691, above, art. ARCHITECTURE, pls. IV-VI; Great Mosque of Damascus, dated 775, Sourdél, *op. cit.*, pl. iv), but the use of *kāshīs* in the form which later spread seems to emerge in the 5th/11th century. One of the first examples of its tentative appearance is to be found at the top of the minaret of the *mas-djid-i djamī* of Dāmghān (2nd half of the 5th/11th century, C. Adle and A. S. Melikian Chirvani, *Les Monuments du xi<sup>e</sup> s. du Dāmghān*, in *Studia Iranica*, i/1 (1972), pl. xxvii). The enamel was also applied, according to A. Godard, *L'Art de l'Iran*, Paris 1962, 366, to render the characters of the inscription more visible, i.e. more legible, on the exterior of buildings (cf. also *ibid.*, pl. 132; M. B. Smith, *The Manārs of Işfahān*, in *AI*, 1936/2, fig. 212). Approximately at the same period points of turquoise blue enamel appeared on buildings (Gonbad-i Surkh, dated 1147 at Marāgha, A. U. Pope, *A Survey of Persian Art*, repr. Tokyo 1964, viii, pl. 341). This new type of insertion of quite small enamelled tablets drew its inspiration from the embossed joints of plaster which are already in existence on the buildings of the 5th/11th century. The arrangement of these small tablets then developed without interruption and various decorative schemes were adopted (funerary tower of Mu'mina Khātūn, dated 1186, at Nakhdjavan, *ibid.*, pl. 345; Gūr-i Amīr, dated 1405, at Samarkand, *ibid.*, ix, pls. 541-3). Emanating from these first productions, two techniques saw the light of day: that of the faience mosaic or *kāshī-yi mu'arraḥ-kārī*, and that of the faience tile or *kāshī-kārī*.

*Kāshī-yi mu'arraḥ-kārī* (or simply *mu'arraḥ-kārī*): this technique consists of cutting, according to precise forms, pieces of monochrome *kāshī* of different colours to compose a polychrome design (technique described by Godard, *op. cit.*, 383-4; H. E. Wulff, *The traditional crafts of Persia*, Cambridge Mass. 1966, 121-5, figs. 188-94; Pope, *op. cit.*, pl. 546). One of the

al-Kazwīnī, *Āthār al-Bilād*, ed. Wüstenfeld, ii, 125. *Kayyim* = husband: al-Bukhārī, *op. cit.*, *Nikāh*, bāb 110 (ed. Kr.-J. iii, 453), and *passim*; 'Umar b. Abī Rabī'a, *op. cit.*, no. 269; *Kayyim* = correct, orthodox: Sūra IX, 36, and *passim*; XCVIII, 4 and thereon, al-Kaṣṭallānī's note on the quotation of this passage from the Qur'ān in al-Bukhārī, *op. cit.*, *Imān*, bāb 34 (Kr.-J., 19).

(A. SCHAADÉ\*)

**KAYYŪM NĀSİRĪ** (1825-1902), born in the village of Yukarı Şirdanl in the canton of Sviazsk in the government of Kāzān, was one of the first and greatest modernist reformers amongst the Tatars of the Volga. After studying at the *madrasa* of Kāzān, where he learnt Arabic, Persian and Russian, Nāşirī founded at Kāzān his own school where, for the first time, such secular subjects as history, arithmetic, geography and Russian language were taught—these being at this time novelties and innovations which bordered on heresy.

Kayyūm Nāşirī wrote over 50 works in Tatar, Turkish, Arabic and Persian; as the possessor of an encyclopaedic mind, he combined the skills of the philologist, folklorist, historian, geographer and ethnologist. His supreme merit was to have created a Tatar literary language, based on the dialect spoken in Kāzān, which replaced the Čaghatay or Eastern Turkish previously used by Tatar writers and which now permitted the extraordinary flowering of Tatar literature towards the end of the 19th century.

His most famous works are the *Fevākih ul-djulesā* (Kāzān 1884), the *Enmūzedj* (Kāzān 1895, on the syntax of the Tatar language), the *Lehçe-i tātārī* (Kāzān 1895-6, 2 vols.) and above all, his famous *Kāzān kālindārī*, an annual publication which appeared from 1870 to 1897 and which represents the best source of information on the origins of *djadid* reformism amongst the Muslims of the Russian empire.

In Russian language, his two basic works are *Obraztsi narodnoy literaturi Kazanskikh Tatar* ("Examples of the popular literature of the Tatars of Kāzān"), in collaboration with N. F. Katanov, in *Izvestiya Obshchestva Arkheologii, Istorii i Etnografii*, xiii/5 (Kāzān 1896), 374-427, and *Pover'ya i Obryadi Kazanskikh Tatar obrazovavshiesya pomimo Vliyaniya na nikh sunitskogo Magometanstva* ("The beliefs and rites of the Tatars of Kāzān formed outside the influence of Sunnī Islam"), in *Zapiski Imperatorskogo Russkogo Geografičeskogo Obshchestva*, vi (Moscow 1880), 243-70.

*Bibliography*: There have been numerous books and articles dealing with Kayyūm Nāşir in Kāzān Tatar, Turkish, Russian and French. In Russian, the most important is *Kayyum Nasiri (1825-1902)*. *Materialy naučnoy sessii posvyashchennoy 120 letiyu so dnya roždeniya* ("Materials of the scientific session devoted to the 120th anniversary of his birth"), Acad. of Sciences, Kāzān Division, Kāzān 1948, pp. 136 (also published in Tatar). In Turkish, there is the important study of Saadet Çagatay, *Abd-ül-Kayyum Nasiri*, in *AÜDTCFD*, x/3-4 (Ankara 1952), 147-60. Finally, in French there is Ch. Lemerrier-Quellejey, *Un réformateur Tatar du XIX siècle*, 'Abdul Qayyum al-Nasyri, in *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique*, iv/1-2 (Paris 19 ), 117-42 (with a complete bibliography). (CH. LEMERCIER-QUELQUEJAY)

**KĀZ** [see **KAḌĀ**].

**KAZA** [see **KAḌĀ**].

**KAZAK**. The word *kazak* in the Turkic language can be first documented in the 8th/14th century in

the meaning "independent; vagabond". These and similar meanings, such as "free and independent man, vagabond, adventurer, etc." are known in the modern Turkic languages too. During the turmoils under the Timūrids, the word signified the pretenders in contrast to the actual rulers, and also their supporters, who led the life of an adventurer or a robber at the head of their men. At the same time, the word began also to be applied to nomad groups which separated from their prince and kinsmen and so came into conflict with the state; later it had also the meaning "nomad", in contrast to the sedentary *Sart* population in Central Asia. The status of *kazak* is also regarded as a very old social institution of the nomad Turkic peoples. The word became the name of a political unit and later an ethnic designation by having been applied in the former meanings to those groups of the Özbek tribal confederacy that had abandoned the Khān Abu'l-Khayr and migrated to the north-east steppes of Turkistān. These ethnic groups formed the core of the population of the present *Kazakistān* (Kazakhstan), retaining later this name. However, it is probable that other Turkic, and probably Mongol, elements were also involved in the ethnogenesis of the modern *Kazak* people. The struggles with the Kalmuks in the 11th/17th century forced the three *Kazak* hordes to make an approach to Russia and to accept the Russian supremacy. Until the beginning of the 20th century, this took the form of a very loose and nominal connection. According to the former Russian tradition, *i.e.* to distinguish the Turkic *Kazaks* from the Slavic *Kazaks* or *Kozaks* (*Cossacks*), the *Kazaks* in Central Asia were also called *Kazak-Kirghiz* in learned and correct parlance. The word *kazak*—borrowed from the Turkic languages—appears in the Russian linguistic records first at the end of the 14th century with a wide range of meanings. The military meaning came later into predominance by applying the word to those military groups which played an eminent role in medieval Russian history. The form *kozak* (*Cossack*) used in western European languages goes back to the Ukrainian and Polish pronunciations. No certain etymology of the word *kazak* has yet been given. The generally known inner-Turkic etymology, from *kaz*—"to flee, to escape" + suffix (nom. act.) *ak*, is not well documented in the linguistic sources and does not find universal acceptance. The recent etymology of the Turkic ethnic name *kaz* (< *az*) + the Iranian ethnic name *sak*, *i.e.*, *saka*, is a vague hypothesis which can hardly be confirmed by historical facts.

*Bibliography*: The relevant linguistic and historic data (with a critical survey of the various etymological approaches) are brought together by G. Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, iii, Wiesbaden 1967, 462 ff. An analysis of these facts from a historico-ethnological aspect is given by L. Krader, *Ethnonymy of Kazakh*, in *American Studies in Altaic Linguistics*, Bloomington-The Hague 1962, 123 ff. A. von Gabain analyses the social status of *kazak* elements in the history of the Turkic peoples in her article *Kasakentum, eine soziologisch-philologische Studie*, in *Acta Orient, Hung.* xi, 161 ff. The Russian linguistic and historic relations are described by G. Stökl, *Die Entstehung des Kasakentums*, Munich 1953, and G. F. Blagova, *Istoricheskie vzaimootnosheniya slov kazak i kazah* (*The mutual historic relations of the words kazak and kazah*), in *Etnonimi*, Moscow 1970, 143 ff.