

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

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

ASSISTED BY F. TH. DIJKEMA AND M^{ME} S. NURIT

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME V

KHE—MAHI



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1986

In modern times, the most important region bearing the name Khöst is that comprised within the modern Afghan province of Pakhtia, lying to the south of the Sefid-Küh range in the basin of the Kaitu, an affluent of the Kurram river which drains eastwards to the Indus; hence the ethnic and tribal connections of Khöst with the regions of Kurram, Kohat and northern Waziristan on the modern Pakistani side of the Durand Line have always been close. Khöst now forms an important forestry region of Afghānistān, and in the southern, sub-tropical zone, dates, citrus fruits, etc. are grown; recent Afghan governments have made considerable agricultural investment here (see J. Hunlum *et alii*, *La géographie de l'Afghanistan, étude d'un pays aride*, Copenhagen 1959, 101, 105, and J. C. Griffiths, *Afghanistan*, London 1967, 119-20). In the 1920s, Khöst was the epicentre of a conservative, traditionalist Pathan rebellion against the tentative reforms of King Amān Allāh, which seriously weakened the ruler's position and damaged the economic health of the country (March 1924-January 1925) (see W. K. Fraser-Tytler, *Afghanistan*³, London 1967, 204-6; V. Gregorian, *The emergence of modern Afghanistan, politics of reform and modernization, 1880-1946*, Stanford 1969, 282-4; L. Dupree, *Afghanistan*, Princeton 1973, 449, 459, 479).

Finally, the *Imperial gazetteer of India*, iii, 138, vi, 306, mentions a Khöst in Balūcistān, the site of a small coalfield, 35 miles east of Quetta.

(C. E. BOSWORTH)

KHOTAN, a town of the People's Republic of China, in the autonomous region of the Uyghurs. The town, and the territory which depends on its resources as an oasis, lie between the desert of Taklamakan and the massif of Kuen-luen on the one hand, and the Kara-Kāsh and Yörüng-Kāsh rivers on the other. The kingdom of Khotan became known to the Chinese world in about 125 B.C., following the mission of Khang K'ien, under the name Yu-t'ien. The name represented by this transcription seems to have had no connection with the town of Yotqan. Although numerous archaeological relics have been found at that site, Yotqan cannot correspond to Yu-t'ien. In fact, according to Pelliot (*Notes on Marco Polo*, 412, s.v. "Cotan"), Yu-t'ien corresponds to *³Odan, with the variant *³Odon arising from the transcription Yu-tuen given by Hiuan-tsang (*ibid.*, 409); the name encountered in the Khotanese texts is just a transcription of the Chinese Yu-t'ien under the form Yüttina, while documents of the 4th century in Kharoshti script give the form Khotana (L. G. Gercenberg, *Khotanosakskiy yazik*, 10). Yotqan is a ruined pre-Islamic cemetery, approximately 8 km. west of the town itself.

In fact, the kingdom of Khotan was not really known to the Chinese until after the conquest of the Tarim basin, carried out by Han Wu-ti (140-87 B.C.), in the years following 110 B.C. and through the reconquest by the later Han between 73 B.C. and ca. 170 A.D. Little is known of the history of the ruling dynasty and the name of the town is always transcribed Yu-t'ien in the Chinese sources. From the latter we learn that the population of the kingdom reached a total of 50,000. All that we can say is that this population spoke a language of Iranian type, which has become known as a result of discoveries made at the beginning of the 20th century and which has been deciphered principally by Lüders, Sten Konow and H. W. Bailey. It now seems that the Khotanese spoke a dialect of the Saka language.

It was in the course of the first centuries A.D.

that the kingdom of Khotan received Buddhism. According to the Tibetan tradition, which agrees in some points with the account given by Hiuan-tsang, Buddhism was introduced to Khotan by a Kashmiri monk called Vairocana, during the reign, almost certainly legendary, of king Vijayasambhava (E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist conquest of China*, in *Sinica Leidensia*, xi, Leiden 1972, 340-1). This assessment is confirmed by the fact that one of the oldest dated Buddhist monuments is from 269 A.D. (A. Stein, *Sand-buried ruins of Khotan*, 1902, 405).

In the 7th century, Hiuan-tsang writes in his *Memoirs* (Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels*, ii, 299): "We arrive in the kingdom of K'iu-sa-tan-na. (Note:) In Chinese, this signifies "Breast of the Earth"; it is the formal name used in the region. The local language uses the expression "Kingdom of Huan-na". The Hiong-nou call it Yu-touen; the Hou (Iranians), Ho-tan; the Indians, K'iu-tan. Formerly they (the Chinese) called it Yu-t'ien; it is an incorrect form". (On this passage, cf. Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo*, 409-17).

Thus, in the T'ang period, the polite and literary form is "Gostana" or "Gaustana", difficult to interpret according to Pelliot; the local language used the expression Xuān-ná (Huana?), this name faithfully rendering the name which appears in the Khotanese texts under the form Hvatāna, Hvamna, and Hvam; the nomads of the north would have pronounced it *³Odan or *³Odon, a name which is found much later in Syriac, translated from Persian, in the story "*The History of the Patriarch Mar Yaballāhā and the monk Rabban Sāumā*", published by Chabot (Paris 1895, 22), where the latter identifies the town of "Lôtôn" with Khotan. In fact "Lôtôn" is an erroneous form from the Persian original, where the lām has appeared as a result of confusion with the initial ālif, whence we deduce the correct form "Odon" proposed by Pelliot fifty years ago, while Budge (*The monks of Kūblāi Khān*, London 1928, 138) and Montgomery (*The history of Yaballaha III*, New York 1927) have retained the form "Lôtôn". This form appears in the works of Kāshgharī (Brockelmann, 251), with "Odon" and "Khotan". Finally, the Iranians would have pronounced it Ho-tan (Xuāt-tan) which assumes an original *Hwatan, precursor of the Khotan of the Muslims, while the Indians would have pronounced it K'iu-tan (*K'iu-tan) which presuppose a form Khutan or Khotan. The land was known to the Tibetans under the name of Li-yul, "land of Li", although they knew the town under the name of Hu-ten, which is just a transcription.

In the T'ang period, the kingdom of Khotan was bounded to the south by the Kuen-luen, while in the east its territory touched that of Kroraina (Niya, Čerčen and the Lob-Nor region), and in the west that of Kāshghar (Khyesa) which stretched from the Pamirs and T'ien-shan to Maralbashi and beyond. The language used throughout the Khotan region was Saka-Khotanese, which was related to the Tadjik vernacular of the Pamirs, of which no ancient evidence has yet been recovered, to the language of Kāshghar in the west and north, of which some traces have been recovered at Tumshuk (the Turkish name of a site whose ancient name has disappeared), and in the east to the language spoken in Kroraina, of which apparently no relics remain.

The kingdom of Khotan at that time had a large population which had, no doubt under the influence of Buddhism, lost all interest in expansion and showed an extreme aversion to matters of war; Hiuan-tsang noted that the Khotanese were remarkable

craftsmen with a considerable taste for literary pursuits, also for music and dance. The region was the centre of a considerable commercial activity, being placed on the southern branch of the Silk Route, which was in use throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages; through the Khotanese texts we possess accounts of the travels of officials to Kashmir and Kansu, which permit us to gain an acquaintance with the geography of Central Asia, in particular the names of towns; thus we find that Kāshghar is Kyesa, Niya is Niña, Čerčen is Ysabađā parrūm, Urumči is Yirrūm-cinā, Turfan is Tturpanā, Leou-lan is Raurata, Yumen kouan is Kviyikye, etc.

The dynasty of the kings of Khotan in the T'ang period (7th-10th centuries), the family name of which was apparently Vija (preferable from Viśa) was in existence before that time, for the history of the Sui (83, 5b) mentions, according to Pelliot (*op. laud.*, 419) a king called Vijayavikrama; under the T'ang, the dynasty is known to us from a list which can be reconstructed from the texts of the History of the T'ang and which can be partially cross-checked by reference to the names preserved in the Khotanese texts; a certain number contained in the latter cannot be placed with certainty in this list; these are: Viśanakhan, Viśakirti, Viśavikram and Viśasagrama. On the other hand, there are some that can be dated, in particular the last kings of the dynasty: Viśasambkhava (912-966), Viśasura (967-977) and Viśadarma (978-982) (Gercenberg, *op. cit.*, 12). It was shortly afterwards that the kingdom of Khotan was conquered by recently-converted Muslim Turks; the kingdom of Khotan was henceforward to be one of the collection of Turkish states in the region which constituted Turkestan.

The town of Khotan, unlike Kāshghar and the northern part of the Tarim basin, is not mentioned by the Hudūd al-Ālam in the description of the Turkish tribes (§ 13, p. 96) in the section of the Yaghmā of eastern Turkestan, but in that of China (§ 9, p. 85). As the Hudūd al-Ālam dates from the year 372/982-3, it may be supposed that in about the year 980, when king Viśadarma, was alive, Khotan and its territory formed a sort of enclave between the region of Kāshghar which was occupied by the descendants of Satuk Bughrā Khān (died 344/955-6) and the territories belonging to China and Tibet; the king of Khotan, according to this source (p. 85), styled himself "Ruler of the Turks and the Tibetans" (*ʿaẓīm al-Turk wa ʿl-Tubbat*).

A little later, Gardizī, who was writing after 431/1040, reports (according to Barthold, *Otčet o poiezdkie v Srednyaya Aziya*, 94) that even the town of Kai (?), situated at fifteen days' march from Khotan in the direction of China, was under the domination of Toghuzghuz Turks (cf. Hudūd al-Ālam, 255). According to Gardizī, the inhabitants of Khotan were Buddhists, but he mentions a Muslim cemetery to the north of the town (*ibid.*, 255, n. 3), and in the town itself two Christian churches, although no documentary evidence of this has been found. As regards the Muslim world, Gardizī shows us that in the first half of the 5th/11th century, Muslim proselytism was already actively exercised in Buddhist circles, and it is possible that the implanting of this group was a contributory cause of subsequent events.

At the beginning of the 5th/11th century, the Turkish rulers of Kāshghār had become very powerful (Barthold, *12 Vorlesungen*, Berlin 1935, 79 ff., particularly 88-90), and had founded the dynasty of the Ķarākhānids (see ILEK-KHĀNS). The son of Bughrā Khān Hārūn, himself the grandson of Satuk Bughrā

Khān, who called himself Ķadīr Khān Yūsuf and reigned in Kāshghār from about 401/1010, decided, for reasons unknown to us, to conquer the territory of Khotan. Seeing that he died in 423/1032 (Ibn al-Athīr s.a.), it is likely that the conquest of Khotan was accomplished sometime between the years 1013 and 1032, for we possess money struck in his name at Kāshghār and at Yarkand from 404/1013-14 onwards (A. Markov, *Inventarniy katalog*, etc., 192 ff.). On the conquests of Khotan, cf. Barthold, *Turkestan*², 281, n. 2.

Later, Khotan, like Kāshghār, passed under the authority of the Ilek-Khāns [*q.v.*], and subsequently under that of the Ķarā-Khitāy [*q.v.*]. After these events, the crisis arising in Central Asia as a result of the expansion of the Mongol empire led the Khārāzm-Shāh to make an agreement with Küčlüg, who had deposed and expelled his father-in-law, the Gür-Khān of the Ķarā-Khitāy, and a partition of the western sector of the Ķarā-Khitāy empire took place, between the two rulers, giving to the Kh̄wārazm-Shāh the territory to the east of the Syr-Daryā as far as the heights of Kāshghār and of Khotan (Barthold, *Turkestan*², 356-7); after his succession to the throne, Küčlüg, who had married the daughter of the Gür-Khān, a Buddhist fanatic, undertook a fierce persecution of Islam in the regions under his authority, particularly in Khotan, after his agreement with the Kh̄wārazm-Shāhs [*q.v.*]. According to Djuwaynī (tr. Boyle, 65-6, 70-3), Küčlüg persecuted the Muslims cruelly and crucified the Imām ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Khotānī at the door of his madrasa in Khotan. In the time of Haydar Mirzā [*q.v.*], nothing more was known of this martyr; even his tomb was unknown (*Taʾrikh-i Rashīdī*, tr. E. D. Ross, 218, and ch. xlii). Thus there was no indigenous historical tradition at Khotan, or if there was, the texts have been lost. Arabic and Persian geographical literature provides us with only the most meagre of information; the real situation is misrepresented by al-Samʿānī (f. 189b) and by Yākūt, who followed al-Samʿānī in his own writing (ii, 403).

Under the reign of Ögedey, Djuwaynī (tr. Boyle, 517) reports that "the lands between the banks of the Amū-Daryā and the frontiers of Khitāy were placed under the orders of the Chief Minister Mahmūd Yalavač and of his son Masʿūd Beg; those included Transoxania, Turkestan, Otrār, the land of the Uyghurs, Khotan, Kāshghār, Djand, Kh̄wārazm and Farghāna". Rashīd al-Dīn (*Djūmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, tr. J. A. Boyle, *The successors of Genghis Khan*, New York-London 1971, 94), also writes as follows: "The Ķaʿan (Ögedey) placed all the lands of Khitāy under (the orders of) Mahmūd Yalavač, and (the region of) Besh-Ballk and Ķarā Khodjo, with the territory of Uyghuristān, Khotan, Kāshghār, Almalik, Qayallk, Samarqand and Bukhārā as far as the banks of the Oxus under (the orders of) Masʿūd Beg, the son of Yalavač". In the remainder of his work, he makes no further mention of Khotan; nevertheless, under the year 1253, Barthold (*12 Vorlesungen*, 184) writes as follows: "After the re-establishment of order, the frontiers of his government (sc. of Masʿūd Beg) were extended further: to him were subjected Transoxania, Turkestan, Otrār, the land of the Uyghurs, Khotan, Kāshghār, Djand, Kh̄wārazm and Farghāna". After the death of Mengü (Möngke) in 1259, a conflict arose between Kubilay [*q.v.*] and his younger brother Ariq-böge in the course of which a cousin of Ariq-böge, the Čaghatayid Alugu, took to himself the entire area entrusted to the authority of Masʿūd Beg; the latter appealed to Ariq-böge who gave him full authority to dispossess Alugu, but in the course of his mission he

went over to the side of Alugu who died *ca.* 1266. As Arik-böge had been eliminated during this period, Kubilai appointed in his place another Čaghatayid, Barak, who took possession of part of the former possessions of his grandfather Čaghatay, but Barak was compelled in his turn to submit to Kaydu, grandson of Ögedey, who sought to reconstitute the territory given to him by Čingiz Khān. (Barthold, *12 Vorlesungen*, 184-6). Finally, a more or less stable equilibrium was established between Kubilai and Kaydu, so much so that according to a passage of Marco Polo (ed. Yule-Cordier, i, 188; ed. Hambis, Paris 1955, 62-3), it is reported that in the 1270s Khotan was under the authority of the Emperor of China, while Yarkand depended on Kaydu.

While Central Asia was the object of partition between great powers, it is nevertheless certain (Barthold, *12 Vorlesungen*, 188-9) that a number of indigenous dynasties survived as vassals, especially at Khotan. In reference to these last, Barthold mentions some Persian verses of which the date is unknown, which were composed in honour of the sultan of Khotan, Munmish-Tegin, the last words being quoted in Turkish (*cāndān bizi ey shah kigüyād Turk "yavlaḳ karī bolmish Munmish Tāgin"*). Barthold (*op. cit.*, 195) also mentions the fact that Djāmāl Karshī, in the appendices (*Mulḥakāt*) to his translation of an Arabic dictionary of the 4th/10th century, devotes considerable space to the town of Khotan, giving a brief description and a list of some persons native to the place. Again according to Barthold (*op. cit.*, 195), Muḥammad Haydar (*op. cit.*, tr. Ross, 301) writing in Kāshgharia, distinguished according to his own terms, four classes at Kāshghar and at Khotan; first—*tūmen*, the peasantry; second—*ḳawcīn*, the army; third—*oymak*, the nomads (who were entitled to a certain quantity of grain, textile goods, etc.); and fourth—the class of the officials and the *‘ulamā’*.

Much later, it seems that Khotan shared the fate of other towns in the Tarim basin, in particular of Kāshghar and other towns in the same region; in the 18th century it was a part of the state established by the Khōdjas, who defeated the descendants of Čaghatay, and were compelled to submit to the domination of the Djungar, and later, in *ca.* 1760, to that of the Manchus who eliminated the Djungar. Later still, in the seventh decade of the 19th century, Khotan was obliged to accept temporary domination by Ya‘kūb Beg and after the death of the latter in 1877 to submit once again to the Manchus. With regard to a historical work completed on 11 Sha‘bān 1311/24 February 1894 in Khotan and dealing with events subsequent to 1280/1863, cf. *Bull de l'Acad.* (1921), 209; cf. also the chapter on the Khōdjas of Khotan in *Ta‘riḳh-i emeniyye*, ed. Pantusov, 161 ff. The principal source for the history of this region is provided by reference in the Chinese dynastic histories and in other works concerning the autonomous region of the Uyghurs itself, which have appeared in Chinese from the 18th century to the present day. It is there that the documentation concerning the town of Khotan is found.

The town itself, like all those in the Tarim basin, has known a variety of activities, but the silk industry which has continued from the Han period to the present day is the principal activity. At the time of writing, the industrialisation of the region is being developed by the People's Republic of China, although it is not possible to assess what progress is being made; it seems that the Chinese government is concentrating there on the search for raw materials. There is no certainty about the population figures; according to Kornilov, *Kashgariya*, Tashkent 1903,

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

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

(L. HAMBIS)

KHOTIN (in Ottoman Turkish usage *Khōtin*; in modern Turkish and in Romanian, *Hotin*; Polish *Choczim* and variants; German *Hwthyn* (15th/century), *Chotim*, *Chotin*, *Choczyn*, etc.; Italian (18th/century) *Cucino*; and other forms): a fortress and town on the right (formerly Moldavian) bank of the Dnestr (Turla), 20 km. south of Kamenets Podolsk (Kamaniča [see *ḲAMANIČA*]). *Khotin* is now (since the end of World War II) in the Ukrainian S.S.R., and forms the administrative centre of the *rayon* of the same name in the *oblast* of Černovits (Cernauti, Czernewitz).

Khotin, which occupied an easily-defensible site at the point where the important mediaeval trade route from the Baltic to Constantinople crossed the Dnestr, was from the mid-14th to the late 18th century a military stronghold and commercial entrepôt of some importance. The region of *Khotin*, which was, in the 16th and 17th centuries, disputed between Poland and Moldavia, had attracted Ottoman attention as early as the reign of Meḥemmed II, and in the 16th century Muslim merchants frequented the route via *Khotin* to Poland. *Khotin* was besieged unsuccessfully by Othman II in 1030/1621; thereafter it was restored to Moldavian control, and is so described by Ewliyā Čelebī, who visited it in the retinue of Melek Ahmed Pasha in 1658 (*Seyāhat-nāme*, v, 124-5). In 1084/1673 *Khotin* was occupied by the Poles, but it was regained by the Ottomans in the following campaign season (Silahdār, *Ta‘riḳh*, Istanbul 1928, i, 628 ff.). The Ottoman occupation of Podolia in 1083/1672 carried the frontiers of the Empire beyond the Dnestr, but with the retrocession to Poland of Podolia, and the evacuation of *Ḳamaniča* in 1110/1699, *Khotin* became the most important Ottoman fortress in the region of the upper Dnestr; this importance was to increase in the course of the 18th century, as the conflict with Russia became ever more acute.

Khotin was occupied by the Russians in 1713; on its return to the Ottomans in 1125/1714, the old fortifications were rebuilt and increased in height by more than a half, as part of a general strengthening and rebuilding programme, which was supervised by a special commission sent from Istanbul. The contemporary Moldavian historian Cantemir described the *Khotin* of this period as the most elegant and well-fortified town of Moldavia, praise which is echoed in an Ottoman description of the town written at the same time. Also in 1125/1714, *Khotin* and its surrounding districts were removed from the jurisdiction of Moldavia and reorganised as an *eyālet*, as part of the strengthened Ottoman frontier defences along the right bank of the Dnestr, becoming, in the words of a German observer, "die einzige Vormauer der Moldau".

The 18th century stronghold of *Khotin* consisted of the medieval *ič kal‘e* and the more extensive new outer works encircling the old fortress on three sides.

familiar (see al-Damīrī, *op. cit.*, ii, 353-4), and modern systematic practice has simply ratified the vox populi in retaining the name "nisnas" and applying it to the Somalian *Cercopithecus pyrrhonotus*. In conclusion, having been born out of confused images of the gibbon and a pygmy in travellers' tales, to become subsequently a monstrous human mutation blighted by divine punishment, the *nasnās* has finally been placed, by common logic, in one of the families defined by *kird*.

Bibliography: In addition to references given in the article, see Kazwīnī, *ʿAdjāʾib al-makhlūqāt*, and Damīrī, *Ḥayāt al-ḥayawān al-kubrā*, Cairo 1356/1937; Ibn al-Fakīh al-Hamadhānī, *K. al-Buldān*, tr. H. Massé, *Abrégé du livre des pays*, Damascus 1973; Ibn Taghribirdī-G. Wiet, *Les biographies du Manhal Ṣāfi*, Cairo 1932; Idrīsī, *Nuzhat al-muṣhtāq (K. Rudjār)*, ed. Leiden, *Opus geographicum*, 5 fascs., 1970-5; Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Rihla*, Cairo 1346/1928; N. Elisséef, *Thèmes et motifs des Mille et une nuits*, Beirut 1949; R. and D. Morris, *Men and apes (with bibliogr.)*, London 1966, Fr. tr. *Hommes et singes*, Paris 1967, and coll. "Marabout", MU No. 219, Paris 1971; M. Lombard, *La chasse et les produits de la chasse dans le monde musulman (VIII^e-XI^e siècle)*, in *Annales ESC* (May-June 1969); B. Heuvelmans, *Sur la piste des bêtes ignorées* (ch. "Les bêtes à face humaine d'Indo-Malaisie"), Paris 1955, i, 13-233; E. G. Boulenger, *Les singes*, Paris 1942. (F. VIRÉ)

KIRESUN [see GİRESÜN].

KIRGİZ, a Turkish people, mentioned as early as the oldest Chinese accounts of Central Asia (from the 2nd century A.D.) under the name Kien-Kuen, which according to P. Pelliot (*JA*, Ser. 2, vol. xv, 137) goes back to a Mongol word, singular *kirkun*. The lands of the Kirgiz are not exactly defined in these sources; according to a very reliable source, the land of the Kien-Kuen lay north-west of the land of the K'ang-Kiu, i.e. of Sogdiana. The name Kirghiz first appears in the Orkhon inscriptions of the 8th century; at that time the Kirgiz (as the contemporary Chinese annals also tell us) lived on the Upper Yenisei (Turkish Kem), north of the Kög-men or Sayan mountains. The same name (Kükman) is also mentioned in Gardīzī (W. Barthold, *Otčet o poezdke v Srednyuyu Aziyu*, 86 = ed. 'Abd al-Ḥayy Ḥabībī, Tehran 1347/1968, 262); according to this source, the capital of the Khān of the Kirgiz was 7 days' journey north of these mountains. There is also said that the Kirgiz had red hair and a white colour of skin (*surkhī-i mūy wa sapīdī-i pūst*), which is explained by their alleged relationship with the Slavs; the same anthropological features, of which there is no longer any trace among the modern Kirgiz, are mentioned in the Chinese *T'ang-shu*; linguistically, the Kirgiz were then already Turkicised. They did not come to the fore politically till about 840 A.D., when they succeeded in conquering the lands of the Uyghur in Mongolia. Nothing was known in Muslim lands of this event; Marquart's endeavour (*Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, Leipzig 1903, 91-2) to connect with this the story in *Djāhīz* of the defeats of the Toghuzghuz, can be utterly rejected; like *Ḳudāma* (ed. de Goeje, 262, l. 13) *Djāhīz* only refers to the hostility between the Toghuzghuz and the *Kharlukh* (*Karluk* [q.v.]). *Iṣṭakhri* (ed. de Goeje, 9-10) and others mention the Kirgiz (*Khirkhīz*) as eastern neighbours of the *Kimāk* [see *KIMĀK*] and as northern neighbours of the *Kharlukh* and Toghuzghuz; in the east their lands are said to have stretched to the ocean. The

most important article of export for trade with Muslim lands was musk. The ethnic and historical continuity between the Kirgiz and the people living today under the same name in the USSR is supposed but not proved. The Kirgiz were probably driven out of Mongolia in connection with the foundation of the empire of the *Khītāy* in the beginning of the 10th century [see *KARĀ KHITĀY*] and the advance of the Mongol peoples; on the other hand, a body of Kirgiz must have migrated as early as this century southwards to the present abode of the genuine Kirgiz (Kara Kirgiz); according to the *Ḥudūd al-ʿālam* (f. 18a, tr. Minorsky, 93, comm. 293-4, even the town of Pančūl (the modern Akṣu in Chinese Turkestan) was in possession of the Kirgiz. The Kirgiz are not mentioned again in this region till the 16th century; what the Chinese Č'ang-Te, who was there in 1259, records of the Kirgiz (especially on the use of dog-sledges, cf. Bretschneider, *Mediaeval researches*, i, 129) he had only been told, and did not see himself, and these stories probably do not refer to the people of the land he passed through. The main body of the people had probably remained on the Upper Yenisei; the *Karā Khītāy* when driven out of North China had to fight with these Kirgiz during their trek westwards. In the fertile region of the modern administrative district of Minusinsk the Kirgiz gradually adopted agriculture and a settled mode of life. According to the *Ḥudūd al-ʿālam* (f. 17b, tr. Minorsky, 97, comm. 286) there was only one town among the Kirgiz, called *Kemidjkat*, where their *Khākān* lived, and no other towns or villages, but only tents; on the other hand, *Rashīd al-Dīn* says (ed. Berezin, *Trudi Vost. Otd. Arkh. Obshč.* vii, 168-9) that the Kirgiz had "many towns and villages". From these and similar statements Radloff has drawn the conclusion (*JA*, Ser. 6, vol. ii, 328) that the present state of Kirgiz culture is much lower than it used to be.

In the 13th century the Kirgiz on the Yenisei had to submit to the Mongols under Čingiz Khān [q.v.]. Negotiations for their submission were already begun in 1207, but it was only settled in 1218 when the last rebellion was put down. After the decline of the empire of the descendants of Čingiz Khān the Kirgiz had sometimes to be under the yoke of the Mongols, sometimes of the Kalmucks, and sometimes of the Russians; in 1607 they recognised the suzerainty of the *Qazāk*, but by 1609 we find them killing a tax-collector sent by the *Qazāk*. In 1642 they were described by the Kalmuck Khān Batur as Kalmuck, in 1646 by the Russian plenipotentiary Daniyil Arshinskiy as Russian subjects. In 1703 they were transferred by the Kalmucks, by arrangement with Russia, southwards to the region of the modern Semirečye; they are then said to have numbered 3,000-4,000 tents. As mentioned above, a portion of the Kirgiz had migrated at a much earlier date; shortly after 1514 a certain Muḥammad is mentioned as being invested as Khān of the Kirgiz by Saʿīd Khān the ruler of the Mongols (*Taʾrikh-i Rashīdī*, tr. E. D. Ross, London 1895, 141); in the 16th century the Kirgiz were for the most part under the rule of the Khāns of the *Qazāk*. The Kirgiz were called *Burul* by Kalmucks; they were nearly all driven out from Semirečye to Farghāna and *Qarātegin*; it was only after the destruction of the Kalmuck empire by the Chinese (1758-9) that they returned to their old settlements in the southern part of Semirečye. At this date the name Kirgiz was transferred to the *Qazāk* by the Russians; to distinguish them from the latter, the true Kirgiz were called

black Kirgiz (Karā Kirghiz). The term "Karā" was never adopted by the people themselves and is now definitely repudiated. In Semirečye, the Karā Kirghiz, outwardly at least, professed Islam; in their epic, which takes its name from the principal hero Manas, the wars against the Kalmucks are described as wars of religion. Unlike the Kazāk, the Karā Kirghiz had neither princes or nobles; the elders, called *Manap*, were not chosen by any kind of election but owed their position entirely to their personal influence. Owing to the continual state of war, the tribes of the Karā Kirghiz did not break up into small subdivisions as was the case with the tribes of the Kazāk; an *aul* (camp) of the Karā Kirghiz comprised the members of a whole tribe and therefore occupied a much greater area than an *aul* of the Kazāk. In the 18th century authority over the Karā Kirghiz was claimed by the Chinese, in the 19th first by the Özbegs in Farghāna and later by the Russians; the final establishment of Russian rule dates from 1864. The prosperity of the Karā Kirghiz has been seriously affected by the Russian colonisation and particularly by the rising of 1916, when a considerable portion of the people migrated to China; the Russian government resolved—but nothing came of it owing to the revolution of 1917—to take from the Karā Kirghiz all their grazing-grounds except the valley of the Tekes and to throw these lands open for Russian colonisation.

Until recently in both Russia and Western Europe the name "Kirgiz" meant particularly the Kazāk; they are sometimes called also "Kirgiz-Kaisak" (Kaisak, corrupted from Kazak, to distinguish them from the Russian Cossacks). On the separation of the Kazāk, from the Özbeg, cf. *ABU 'L-KHAYR* and *KAZĀK*. The whole of the Kazāk people was for long under the rule of one Khān who therefore had a considerable military force at his disposal; Khān Kāsīm (d. 924/1518) was particularly powerful. In spite of several defeats from the Mongols allied with the Özbegs in the 16th century, the Kazāk still had a strong nomadic kingdom at the end of this century under the rule of Khān Tawakkul, who, during the last years of the reign of Khān 'Abd Allāh b. Iskandar [q.v.] was able to make a successful incursion into Mā warā al-Nahr, and later still even held the town of Tāshkent. In the 17th century the power of the Khāns only rarely extended over the whole people; but about this time Tāshkent and Farghāna were usually in the possession of the Kazāk, sometimes under nominal recognition of the suzerainty of the Khāns of the Özbegs. At this time must have taken place the division of the Kazāk into three "Hordes" (called by the Kazāk themselves *djüz* "hundred"; the great horde (*ulu djüz*) occupied the most easterly, the little (*kishi djüz*) the most westerly part of the so-called "Kirgiz steppes" and between the two the central horde (*orta djüz*). Towards the end of the 17th century this division was already an accomplished fact. Khān Tyawka, celebrated as the law-giver of his people (in 1694 a Russian embassy was received by him in the town of Turkistān and in 1698 one from the Kalmucks), still ruled all three Hordes and had a representative in each of them. In 1717 unsuccessful negotiations for the submission of all three Hordes to Peter the Great were conducted; in 1723 the towns of Sayrām, Tāshkent and Turkistān were conquered by the Kalmucks. For a short period after this, the suzerainty of the Khān of the Little Horde was recognised by all the Kazāk and the agreement embodying this was sealed by the sacrifice of a white horse; but the treaty had no practical

results. In 1730, Abu 'l-Khayr negotiated with Russia and concluded a treaty by which he declared himself and his people Russian subjects. This treaty was renewed several times in the 18th century; but it was not till the 19th century, especially after 1847, when the Russians were firmly established on the southern frontier of the Kirgiz steppes on the Sir Daryā, that Russian rule became definitely established over the steppes and their inhabitants. The eastern part of the steppes was administered from Siberia and the western from Orenburg; regulations for the government of the Siberian Kazāk were published in 1822 and again in 1868. Even after the abolition of the Khān's authority, the descendants of Čingiz Khān or "Sultans" exercised a considerable influence over the people as a nobility (among the Kazāk called "white bones", *ak süyek*); their authority has been gradually destroyed by the measures of the Russian Government. The last popular leader of the Kazāk was Kenesari, who fought against the authorities in Siberia and Orenburg from 1842 in the mountains of Ala Tau; several risings were stirred up until 1873 by his son Sadik (so-called by the Russians, properly Šiddik). Another son, Ahmad, later wrote the life of his father Kenesari and of his brother Sadik, entitled: *Sultan Kenisara i Sadik. Biografičeskiye očerki sultana Akhmeta Kenisarina. Obrabotano dlya pečati i snabženo primečaniyami E. T. Smirnovim, Tashkent 1889* (review by V. Rosen in *Zap.*, iv, 122-3).

The most southern part of the Kirgiz steppes was conquered in the 19th century by the Özbegs of Farghāna and Khīwa and partly colonised; the advance of the Russians in this part was therefore assisted by the Kazāk. After the foundation of the general-gouvernement of Turkestan (1867) and the general-gouvernement of the Steppes (1882) (Semirečye belonged at first to the latter, but was later again united to Turkestan), the government of Kirgiz steppes had less unity than before. On the other hand, after the Revolution an administrative unit was established called at first by the Russians the "Kirgiz Republic" and by the people themselves "Kazākistān". Today the Kirgiz form one of the Union Republics in the USSR. The number of the population in the Kirgiz Socialist Soviet Republic was 3,145,000 in 1973 (43.8% Kirgiz, 24.2% Russians, 11.3% Uzbeks, etc.). The whole number of Kirgiz living in the USSR was 1,452,000 in 1970. The number of Kirgiz living in China and Afghanistan is over 100,000. The Kirgiz language belongs to the northwestern (Kipchak) group of Turkic languages.

Bibliography: There exists the following guide to the bibliographies: E. E. Novičenko, *Bibliografiya bibliografii o Kirgizii. 1852-1967. Annotirovanniy ukazatel' literaturi*, Frunze 1969.—The most important of earlier bibliographies are: A. N. Kharuzin *Bibliografičeskiy ukazatel' statey, kasayushčikhsya etnografii Kirgizov i Karagirgizov*, in *Étnografičeskoye Obozreniye*, ix (1891); N. Veselovskiy, *Dopolneniye k bibliografičeskom ukazatelyu statey, kasayushčikhsya Kirgizov i Karagirgizov, sostavlenomu A. N. Kharuzinim*, in *Étnografičeskoye Obozreniye*, ix (1891); A. E. Alektorov, *Ukazatel' knig, žurnal' nkh i gazetnikh statey i zametok o kirgizakh*, in *Izvestiya Obshchestva Arkheologii, Istorii i Étnografii pri Imperatorskom Kazanskom Universitete*, xvi-xx (1900-4); Z. L. Amitin-Shapiro, *Literatura o Kirgizii (1918-1924). Annotirovanniy ukazatel'*, Frunze 1963; idem, *Literatura o Kirgizii (1925-1936). Annotirovanniy ukazatel'*, Frunze 1965; idem, *Annotirovanniy*

ukazatel' literatury po istorii, arkhologii i etnografii Kirgizii (1750-1917), Frunze 1958. The fullest history of the Kirgiz steppes is that by A. Levshin, *Opisaniye Kirgiz-kaisakskikh ord i stepy*, St. Petersburg 1832; this is supplemented by many quotations in Velyaminov-Zernov, *Issledovaniya o kazimovskikh tsaryakh i tsarevichakh*, ii. Of general works, see W. Barthold, *Histoire des turcs d'Asie Centrale*, Paris 1945; R. Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*, Paris 1952; D. Sinor, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Eurasie Centrale*, Wiesbaden 1963; S. M. Abramzon, *Kirgiz i ikh étnogeneticheskie i istoriko-kul'turnye svyazi*, Leningrad 1971. On everyday life (esp. of the Kazāk) in the 19th century: W. Radloff, *Aus Sibirien*², Leipzig 1893, i; idem, *Proben der Volkslitteratur, etc.*, iii, v. On laws: N. Grodekov, *Kirgizi i Karakirgizi Syr-Daryinskoy oblasti*, Tashkent 1889. On present conditions: *Obzor narodnogo khozyaystva Kirgizskoy A.S.S.R. 1924 god*, Pod red. Y. P. Krutilina; S. A. Tokarev, *Étnografiya narodov SSSR. Istoričeskiye osnovy bita i kul'tury*, Moscow 1958 (with a lengthy bibliography). On language and literature: *Philologiae turcae fundamenta*, i-ii, Wiesbaden 1959-64. (W. BARTHOLD - [G. HAZAI])

KIRID [see KIRITISI].

KIRIM, a peninsula jutting out into the Black Sea south of the Ukraine (Russian Krim; English Crimea; French Crimée; German Krim; with an area of 25,500 km²), connected with the mainland by the isthmus ca. 8 km. wide of Perekop (in Turkish Or Kapi), and ending to the east in the peninsula of Kerç [q.v.]. The northern and central parts are flat; to the south lies a mountainous area consisting of three ranges, the most southern of which, Mt. Yayla (1,545 m. high), falls down steeply to the coastal strip. The climate is relatively mild and on the south-eastern coast similar to that of the Mediterranean area. The water of the few rivers and brooks—especially that of the Salghir—is used for irrigation. The flat grounds are cultivated; in the mountains there are pastures besides woods, and wine-growing is not without importance. Some minerals are found (iron ore near Kerç, fluorspar near Sevastopol) and at present there is also all kinds of industry.

In antiquity, the peninsula was inhabited by the Scythians. From the 6th century B.C. onwards, Greek colonies existed on the coasts. Around 480 B.C. these formed the Bosporean State, whereas in the 1st century B.C. they belonged for a short time to the Pontian kingdom. From 63 B.C. onwards, the Roman Empire wielded supreme rule (see *Paulys Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, new ed. by G. Wissowa, vi. Halbband, Stuttgart 1899, cols. 2254-69; H. G. Gundel, *Die Krim im Altertum*, in *Das Gymnasium*, liii (1942), 117-38). In the 4th century A.D. first the Goths came, then the Huns. Until 1239 the Byzantine empire held the Chersonese (Old Russian Korsun²), while the main part of the peninsula belonged to the territory of the Khazars [q.v.]. During the 10th and 11th centuries there was the Russian colony Tmutarakan² (probably near modern Taman²), important in relations with Byzantium. From around 1030 the peninsula was dominated by the Kumans or Kıpçak [q.v.], and from 1239 by the Tatars of the Golden Horde. They also wielded a sort of supreme rule over the Genoese colonies that came into existence here (since 1261-5, especially in Kaffa, mod. Feodosiya, see KERE). These colonies took over the role of the Byzantine Chersonese and became of great significance for trade with Byzantium and the Mediterranean area until their downfall in 1475.

They were to a certain extent tributary to the Tatars. Occasional plunderings of these towns by the Golden Horde (see BATUIDS), e.g. in 1298-9, or sieges, e.g. 1343, remained incidental.

Kirim is only rarely mentioned by the Arab geographers (and even then partly following the Italian reports, as by Idrisi). The first contact with Islam dates from a campaign of the Rūm Salḡūkid sultan Kay Kūbād 'Alā' al-Dīn II [q.v.] (616-34/1219-36). After the Golden Horde occupied the peninsula, first in 1223 and then, definitively, in 1238-9, the religious situation did not change immediately. At the instigation of the Egyptian Mamlūks (who entertained trade relations with the peninsula) a mosque was erected at Old Kirim (also Solkhat/Solghad); another was built later by the Khān Özbek (712-42/1313-41) [q.v.].

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

Next, there existed of old also Jewish settlements, but little is known about them in these centuries except from tombstones. Karaites or Karā'im [q.v.] were found at Čufut Kale, and the Orthodox Christians had a bishopric of Gothia at Old Kirim. Western or Latin Christianity, supported mainly by the Franciscans, was represented by the Genoese until the downfall of the latter in 1475. Already in 1261 a Latin bishop is mentioned, and in 1318 the bishopric of Kaffa was founded. Its jurisdiction stretched from Varna (in modern Bulgaria) to Sarāy [q.v.], the capital of the Golden Horde. The bishopric of Cherson, which came into being in 1303, was definitively established in 1333, with parishes in the individual towns. From here efforts were made to effect a union with the other Christians and to start missionary work among the Tatars, but at the end of the 14th century these attempts came to an end for lack of success. From 1351 until after 1370 there had even existed a Latin bishopric at Sarāy.

In the 14th century, during embittered fights with the Venetians in the Mediterranean and the Aegean Sea, the Genoese founded trading factories in Sugḡdaḡ (Russian Surož), in Balaklava (then Cembalo), in modern Sevastopol, in Tana (Azov, Turkish Azak [q.v.]) and in Moncastro (Aḡ Kirmān [q.v.], Rumanian Cetatea Albă, since 1368) to the west of the mouth of the Dnēstr. Until 1343 the Venetians had a colony at Tana (Azov). Besides Italians, who had their own rule and system of justice, there were living in these towns Arabs from various Near Eastern lands; Turks from Anatolia; Lurs [q.v.]; Greeks; and above all, such a large number of Armenians that Kirim was sometimes called Armenia Magna or Armenia Maritima. About the Crimean Goths we are informed by reports of the 13th century, and latterly in the 16th century by Augier Ghislain de Busbecq, ambassador of the Austrian emperor to Süleymān II (see E. S. Forster, *The Turkish letters of Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq*, Oxford 1927, repr. 1968; W. von den Steinen, *Vier Briefe Busbecqs aus der Türkei*, 1926). Since that time they have merged with the Kirim Tatars.

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

pashāpūya whose Persian name Kolēn, with *imāla*, was Arabicised as Kulayn and Kulīn. His *nisba* is thus variously given in the sources as al-Kulaynī, al-Kulīnī, or, erroneously, al-Kalīnī.

Few facts are known about his life. Since his chief transmitters of Imāmī traditions were several scholars of Ḳumm, it is certain that he studied in that town for a prolonged time, most likely during the last decade of the 3rd century A.H. (903-13). He also transmitted from several scholars of Rayy, among them his maternal uncle Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī, known as 'Alān, and al-Nadjāshī describes him as the *shaykh* of the Imāmiyya in Rayy in his time. It is uncertain if it was in Naysābūr or elsewhere that he heard Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Naysābūrī, his transmitter of the traditions and views of the prominent Imāmī scholar al-Faḍl b. Shādhān of Naysābūr, whom he evidently held in high esteem. At an unknown date, perhaps in the first decade of the 4th century A.H. (913-23), he moved to Baghdād where he lived and taught in the Darb al-Silsila near the Bāb al-Kūfa on the west bank of the Tigris. Here he completed his voluminous *Kitāb al-Kāfi*, on which he is said to have worked for twenty years. The book, though mostly a collection of traditions of the Imāms, was meant to be a guide to authoritative Imāmī doctrine in theology and *fiqh*. Thus it is arranged according to subject matter and tends to contain only those traditions which the author considered as reflecting orthodox teaching. Only exceptionally are the views and elaborations of Imāmī scholars quoted, such as the elaborations of al-Faḍl b. Shādhān on the law of inheritance. The work is divided into the *uṣūl*, dealing mainly with theology, prophecy, the imāmate, and prayers; the *furū'*, dealing with *fiqh*; and a final volume, entitled *K. al-Rawḍa*, containing miscellaneous traditions of mostly edifying or paraenetic character. His other works, all of which are lost, included a refutation of the *Ḳarāmiṭa*, a book on transmitters (*ridjāl*), a collection of letters of the Imāms, an anthology of poems about them, and a book on the interpretation of dreams. The date of his death is given as 328/939-40 or 329/940-1. The latter date, mentioned by al-Nadjāshī, is more likely to be correct, since al-Ṭūsī, who in his earlier *K. al-Fihrist* gives the year 328, in his later *K. al-Ridjāl* specifies Shābān 329/May 941. The funeral prayer was led by the Imāmī Ḥasanid Abū Ḳirāṭ Muḥammad b. Dja'far, and he was buried near the Bāb al-Kūfa.

The reputation of al-Kulaynī and his *K. al-Kāfi* appears to have been modest during his lifetime and for a century after his death. Ibn al-Nadīm (writing in 377/987-8) does not even mention him, and Aḥmad b. 'Abdūn (d. 423/1030) observed that his tomb had become obliterated. The *K. al-Kāfi* was evidently not widely used in the Imāmī communities as an authoritative source of *fiqh*. Though the *Shaykh* al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022) in Baghdād referred to it as one "of the most important and useful books of the Shī'a", his student the Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436/1044) included al-Kulaynī in his general censure of the Imāmī traditionist school of Ḳumm and accused him of including numerous forged and rationally absurd traditions in the *K. al-Kāfi*. It seems to have been largely due to the influence of the *Shaykh* al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1068), who praised al-Kulaynī and relied extensively on the *K. al-Kāfi* in his *fiqh* works, that the latter gained popularity. The favour in which the *K. al-Kāfi* was held by the pro-Mu'tazilī Imāmī school of Baghdād, in spite of the criticism of al-Murtaḍā, was partially based on al-Kulaynī's support

of the theology of the anti-anthropomorphist wing within the school of Ḳumm which was later represented by Ibn Bābawayh al-Ṣadūq, the only scholar of Ḳumm whose works were preserved in large number, evidently because of their author's relative closeness to Mu'tazilī theological doctrines. The *K. al-Kāfi* soon came to be considered as one of the four canonical collections of traditions on which Imāmī *fiqh* is to be based, and often as the most authoritative one among them. It reached the peak of its fame in the Ṣafawid and post-Ṣafawid age, when numerous commentaries, interpretations, glosses, studies of various aspects, Persian translations, and an abridgment of it were composed. A tomb of al-Kulaynī with a *ḡubba* was now shown on the east bank of the Tigris near the modern al-Ma'mūn bridge in Baghdād, and has continued to attract large numbers of visitors until the present.

Bibliography: al-Nadjāshī, *al-Ridjāl*, Tehran n.d., 292 f.; al-Ṭūsī, *Fihrist kutub al-shī'a*, ed. A. Sprenger, Calcutta 1853-5, 326-7; idem, *al-Ridjāl*, ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āl Baḥr al-'Ulūnī, Nadjaf 1381/1961, 495 f.; Ibn Shahrāshūb, *Ma'ālim al-'ulamā'*, ed. 'Abbās Iḡbāl, Tehran 1353/1934, 88; Ibn al-Athīr, viii, 273; Ibn Ḥadjar, *Lisān al-mizān*, Ḥaydarābād 1329-31/[1911-13], v, 433; al-Baḥrānī, *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrayn*, ed. Muḥ. Ṣādiq Baḥr al-'Ulūnī, Nadjaf 1386/1966, 386-95; al-Ḳh'wānsārī, *Rawḍāt al-djannāt*, ed. A. Ismā'īliyān, Ḳumīn 1390-2/1970-2, vi, 108-19; 'Alī Ḥusayn Maḥfūz, introd. to 'Alī Akbar al-Ḡhaffārī's ed. of al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi*, Tehran 1381/1961.

(W. MADELUNG)

KULDJA or GHULDJA, modern Ili or I-ling, a town in the fertile and mineral-rich upper valley of the Ili river [q.v.] in Central Asia. For the mediaeval history of the district in which modern Ḳuldja lay, see ALMALĪGH.

The town of Ḳuldja ("Old Ḳuldja") was probably a new foundation in 1762 by the Chinese after their victory over the Kalmucks [see KALMUK] in 1759, and they named it Ning-yüan-chen. Two years later the town of Hoi-yüan-chen was founded as the headquarters of the Chinese governor-general (*dsandsün*) of Chinese Turkestan; this was known as "Great" or "New" Ḳuldja. The Imperial government resettled in the largely depopulated region, amongst other peoples, 6,000 families of Muslim Turks from Kāshgharia, after the devastation of the latter province during the wars with the Kalmucks; these came to be called the Tarāncīs, "agriculturists". Also in the 18th century were settled there Chinese Muslims (probably, in fact, of mixed Chinese and Uyghur Turkish blood) called the Dungsans or T'ung-kan. In 1851 a trade treaty was made at Ḳuldja between the advancing Russians and the Chinese, opening the upper Ili region to Russian traders, and in 1860 the Treaty of Peking between Russia and China gave both Russia and Britain the right to establish consulates in, amongst other places, Ḳuldja. In 1862 W. Radlov visited both Old and New Ḳuldja and described them fully in his *Aus Siberien*, Leipzig 1893, ii, 305 ff., 336 ff., see also his *Das Ili-Thal in Hoch Asien und seine Bewohner*, in *Petermann's Mittheilungen* (1866); a decade or so later, the American traveller E. Schuyler visited Old Ḳuldja and its hinterland, see his *Turkistan, notes of a journey in Russian Turkistan, Khokand, Bukhara, and Khuldja*, London 1876, ii, 156-201.

Following a Dungan rebellion in Shen-si, which spread to Kan-su [see KANSU] and other Muslim

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

The Russians probably assumed that Ya'kūb Beg would never be dislodged from power and that the Kuldja district would eventually be permanently annexed. In fact, Ya'kūb Beg was defeated in 1876-7 by the Chinese forces and died in May 1877; his state collapsed totally and Chinese authority was restored in Eastern Turkestan. In 1879 negotiations began between the Chinese diplomat Ch'ung-hu and the imperial Russian government, but the Treaty of Lividia made in that year was abortive, and negotiations dragged on for a considerable time, the retrocession of Kuldja being used as a bargaining counter for extracting concessions elsewhere, till in 1881 the Treaty of St. Petersburg was made, and in 1883 Kuldja was finally evacuated by Russia. Russia nevertheless retained trading privileges in the upper Ili valley, received an indemnity of 9 million dollars for the expenses of the Russian occupation, and acquired consulates at Kuldja and Kāshghar which in the ensuing decades gave her important influence in Chinese Turkestan, e.g. during the period of the Chinese Revolution 1911-12, when Chinese settlers in the Kuldja region were massacred by the Muslims and the Russian consular defence forces of troops enlarged. Chinese Turkestan was from 1882 onwards organised as a formal province of China under the name of Sin-kiang "New dominion". The population of [Old] Kuldja was estimated at 7,700 in 1872, of whom 4,100 were Muslims; two or three years later, Schuyler estimated the population of the town at 10,000, over half of whom were Tarančis. These estimates were made at a time when the whole region was in a devastated and depopulated condition, and by ca. 1900, the estimated population of Kuldja had risen to 30,000.

When the authority of the Manchu Imperial government in the Sin-kiang capital of Urumchi

crumbled in 1911, a revolutionary government proclaimed its independence in the Ili region, but in 1912 the new Chinese governor of the whole province, Yang Tseng-hsin (1911-28) managed to conciliate the separatists and secure unification of the Ili and Sin-kiang regions (see R. Yang, *Sinkiang under the administration of governor Yang Tseng-hsin, 1911-1928*, in *Central Asiatic Jnal.*, vi [1961], 270-7). Yang weathered a further potential crisis in 1916-17, when thousands of Kazakhs fled from Tsarist Russian oppression into the Ili and Kāshgharia regions (*ibid.*, 305-8), and under his long tenure of power, the whole of Chinese Turkestan enjoyed an unwonted period of prosperity and firm government. He kept up good relations with Soviet Russia, and even after the Kuomintang's diplomatic break with Russia in 1927, the Russian consulates at Kuldja and in other towns remained open. His successor Chen Shu-jen followed a similar policy, and in a secret treaty of 1931 conceded to the Russians rights to commercial offices in Kuldja or Ili, Urumchi, etc.

These governors in the far west of China had been virtually autonomous, but in 1941 Chiang Kai-shek managed to extend the direct control of Chunking over Sin-kiang, with disquieting effects on the non-Chinese population elements there. Hence in November 1944 there was a rebellion of the Kazakh Turks in the Ili region, soon joined by the Uyghurs. An Eastern Turkestan Republic was proclaimed in Kuldja, independent of the Sin-kiang Chinese provincial government in Urumchi. The Kuomintang government in distant Chunking was unable to do more than come to a compromise with Ahmad Džān's régime in Kuldja, but by the end of 1948 its influence in Sin-kiang was in any case declining perceptibly. In September 1949 representatives both of the Kuldja régime and the Urumchi one started negotiating with the Communists in Peking, and in December of that year a Communist Provincial People's government was established in Sin-kiang. The Communists eventually accorded to the province a certain autonomy, and in 1954 the Kuldja region was made into the Ili Kazakh Autonomous District of what in 1955 became the Sin-kiang Uighur Autonomous Region. Now, under the Chinese name of I-ning, Kuldja is one of the chief towns of that Region.

Bibliography: (in addition to sources mentioned in the article): C. P. Skrine, *Chinese Central Asia*, London 1926; O. Lattimore *et alii*, *Pivot of Asia, Sinkiang and the Inner Asian frontiers of China and Russia*, Boston 1950, 36-9; R. A. Pierce, *Russian Central Asia 1867-1917, a study in colonial rule*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1960, 11, 28; J. A. Dabbs, *History of the discovery and exploration of Chinese Turkestan*, The Hague 1963, index; G. M. Wheeler, *The modern history of Soviet Central Asia*, London 1964; A. Lamb, in *Zentral-asien*, ed. G. Hambly, Frankfurt 1966, ch. xx, Eng. tr. London 1969. (C. E. BOSWORTH)

KULLIYYA (A. lit. "completeness"; Turkish: *fakülte*; Persian: *dāniṣṭhāda*) acquired in the 19th century the technical meaning of faculty as a unit of teaching and learning, mostly at the university level, according to branches of learning.

Islamic education in *masdjid*, *madrassa* or *khānaḡāh* did not know of a division into *kulliyyāt*, which presupposes institutionalised specialisation. So it was only in 1930 that al-Azhar in Cairo was reorganised according to three *kulliyyāt* of higher studies: *uṣūl al-dīn*, *sharī'a*, and *al-dirāsāt al-'arabiyya*. Nadjaf in Irāq, as a centre of *Shī'ī Ithnā*

(II, 255, III, 2). On the other side, we have seen that the problem for the metaphysician is to know who established the existence of its object. Ibn Sīnā believes that this object, being implied in all sciences, does not need be to vouched for by one of them. Moreover, it is for metaphysics to provide the role of supplying the other sciences with the basis of their object. Ibn Rushd criticises this viewpoint, but by relying on his own one, namely that the first philosophy poses the question to itself about substance as the first analogue of being. "Ibn Sīnā, believing in the truth of the doctrine which does not want any of the sciences to set forth its own principles, and taking that *simpliciter*, believes that it is the task of the person who concerns himself with the first philosophy to give a clear exposition of the existence of substance apprehendable by the senses, eternal or not. He says that the natural scientist posits by hypothesis that nature exists (*yaḍa'u waḍ'ān anna 'l-ṭabī'ā mawḍūda*) and that the scholar of divine science is the one who gives the demonstrable proof of its existence" (*Tafsīr*, iii, 1423-4). Ibn Rushd then replies: "Yes, the specialist in the first philosophy seeks for the principles of substance as substance and sets forth clearly that the separateness of substances is the principle of the physical substance. But in making clear this search, he constantly calls for (*yuṣādiru*) what physics clearly sets forth, whether in regard to the substance which can be generated and is corruptible, in the first book of the *Physics* (189 B 30-191 b 34), where it is demonstrated that it is made up of matter and form, or whether in regard to the eternal substance, in Book viii (260 a 20 ff.), where it is set forth that the driving force of that substance is stripped of all matter. Then he clearly lays down that the principles of the substance which are neither the Universal ideas (*al-kullīyyāt*) nor the Numbers (*al-a'dād*) [of Plato]" (*ibid.*, 1424-5). One should mention a final divergence between the two philosophers. Ibn Rushd notes that Aristotle, in the tenth book of the *Metaphysics*, has an enquiry into the unit, the multiple, the identical (*hūwa huwa*), the similar, the opposite and into still further notions "which bring out the general concomitants (*al-lawāḥik al-āmma*) of the being as such" (*Tafsīr*, iii, 1403). In effect, metaphysics is a speculation about the being as such and about the "things" which are concomitant with it" (*al-umūr al-lāhika lahu*) (*ibid.*, iii, 1395). Now we have seen that what is concomitant with being for Ibn Rushd is the division of being for Ibn Sīnā. It seems that this fundamental divergence holds good for all the other oppositions.

Ibn Sīnā's metaphysics is consequently open to a region beyond the world, the earth and the heavens; it makes a mystical system possible. For Ibn Rushd, on the contrary, although metaphysics studies the principles of beings which are objects of other sciences, it is not the foundation of those sciences, but their completion. He writes in his *Tafsīr*, ii, 701, "Since ... each science only concerns itself with studying a certain being which is its special object, it is clear that there must necessarily exist a science which studies the absolute being (*al-huwiyya al-muṭ-laka*); if there were not, our knowledge of things would not be completely exhaustive (*lam tustawfa marīfat al-ashyā'*)" (*Tafsīr*, ii, 701). Furthermore, whilst Ibn Rushd seeks for the first cause of the movements of substances apprehendable by the senses, corruptible or incorruptible, and finds it in the immobile Prime Mover, Ibn Sīnā sets himself the task of "making an enquiry into the first cause from which

every being is brought about by causality (*kullu mawḍūḍ ma'lūl*) in as much as it has been the result of causality, and not simply in as much as it is a mobile being (*mawḍūḍ mutaharrik*) or a quantifiable being (*mawḍūḍ mutakammim*) (*Shifā'*, *Ilāhiyyāt*, i, 14). But there is a problem there; it is not possible for metaphysics to speculate on causes in as much as they are causes *simpliciter* (*al-asbāb bi-mā hiya asbāb muṭlaka*), in the first place because this science treats of notions "which do not raise the question of proper accidents owed to these causes as such, such as the notions of universal and particular, of act and capability, of possibility and necessity" (*ibid.*, 7); and then because the science of causes taken *simpliciter* presupposes that the existence of causes has been established for the things which have a cause (*iḥbāt al-asbāb li 'l-umūr dhawāt al-asbāb*). Ibn Sīnā adopts here a very clear view of the problem of causality: it is not sufficient for the existence of a cause to be demonstrated in the eyes of reason. The existence of causes and effects is not proved by an intuition of causality; it comes from the division of being into the necessary and the possible. The first cause is thus the being necessary by itself. This is why there exists a being necessary so that all other beings have causes, since these exist even at the time when they are only possibilities. Now if one adopts as the point of departure experience of things apprehendable by the senses, all the causes that one will find are at the same time effects. One would not therefore be able, by tracing back the series of cause-effects, to reach the first cause, whether one went back infinitely or whether one came to a stop, as did Aristotle in his search for the Prime Mover, by an arbitrary decision: ἀναγκη στηναι! On this point, Ibn Sīnā has set forth a highly original idea in his *Ishārāt* (ed. Sulaymān Dunyā, Cairo 1958, iii, 454-5). It concerns the position of the cause which is not an effect, in relation to the series of cause-effects. If it forms part of their ensemble (*djumla*), it is necessarily an extreme limit (*ṭaraf*). But if one takes a series made into a hierarchical chain (*silsila murattiba*) of causes and effects which is made up only of cause-effects, "there is a need for an external cause for this ensemble, but undoubtedly in continuity with it in regard to limit (*iḥtādīyat ilā 'illa khāridīja 'anhā, lākinnahā tattaṣilu bihā ... ṭarafan*)". Ibn Sīnā envisages the case where this succession is infinite, and then the cause-effects would form an infinitely limited ensemble. This ensemble is the universe; God is its "limit", but He is exterior to it. On the contrary, Ibn Rushd's Prime Mover is probably at the peak of the hierarchy of substance, but it is a substance and forms part of the world of substances. Just as metaphysics finishes off the sciences, likewise God supports the universe like the keystone of an arch.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(R. ARNALDEZ)

MA CHUNG-YING (*Matthews' Chinese-English Dictionary*, Revised American Edition 1969, characters nos. 4310, 1505, 7489), also known as 尅A SSU-LING, or "Little Commander" (尅A is an affectionate diminutive used in colloquial Kansu Chinese—see the *Hsin-Hua tsu-tien*, Peking 1971, 124; Ssu-ling: see *Matthews'*, nos. 5585, 4043), the youngest and best-known of the five Chinese Muslim warlords comprising the "Wu Ma" clique [q.v.] which controlled much of Northwest China during the latter half of the Republican Period (1911-49).

Little is known of Ma Chung-ying's early years.

He was born at Linhsia (formerly Hochow) in south-eastern Kansu, ca. 1910 (there is a contradiction in the *Biographical dictionary of Republican China*, which holds that Ma was born in 1911, but that he became a junior officer in 1926 "at the age of seventeen"; *op. cit.*, 463, col. 1). Little is known of Ma's immediate family, but it is clear that he shared the same paternal grandfather as the Kansu-Chinghai warlords Ma Pu-ch'ing (*Matthews'*, nos. 4310, 5363, 1168) and Ma Pu-fang (*Matthews'*, nos. 4310, 5363, 1815), and that he was thus a scion of the powerful Ma family of Pieh-tsang, a small village some 30 km. west of Linhsia (Mei, *op. cit.* in *Bibl.*, 660). Ma Chung-ying was also distantly related to the Kansu-Ningshia warlords Ma Hung-k'uei (*Matthews'*, nos. 4310, 2386, 3651) and Ma Hung-pin (*Matthews'*, nos. 4310, 2386, 5259), the most powerful representatives of the Ma family of Han-chia-chi, a large village some 25 km. south-west of Linhsia. Together these five Hui warlords were to become famous—or infamous—as the "Wu Ma" Northwestern Muslim clique.

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

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

The *Kuominchün* "pacification" of Kansu left large areas of the province devastated, but failed to break the rebellious spirit of its people. In 1927

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

In 1929 Ma Chung-ying, his position strengthened by several victories over the forces of the *Kuominchün*, approached the Nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek with a request that his private army should be recognised as a *Kuomintang* frontier unit. At about this time, Feng Yü-hsiang declared himself independent of the National Government at Nanking; as a result of this, Ma Chung-ying's distant relative Ma Hung-k'uei, the strongest of the "Wu Ma" clique, declared in favour of the nationalist cause. Ma Chung-ying went to Nanking, where he enrolled briefly at the military academy. In 1930 he returned to Kansu where he was appointed garrison commander at Kanchow (Changyeh) in the far north-west, near the frontier of Sinkiang [*q.v.*]; from here he controlled a small fief, including the towns of Suchow and An-hsi, which "freed him from any financial

worry and allowed him to prepare his army for an expedition to Sinkiang" (Nyman, *op. cit.* in *Bibl.*, 101). Before striking out into Sinkiang, however, Ma seems to have made another bid to extend his personal power base in Kansu. Once again he met with failure, this time at the hands of his uncle Ma Pu-fang (Norins, *op. cit.* in *Bibl.*, 41).

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

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

In April 1933 the incompetent Chin Shu-jeu was ousted by Sheng Shih-ts'ai, his Chief-of-Staff. The new warlord, whose home province was Liaoning in the far Northeast, enjoyed the support of a group of some 3,000 battle-hardened Manchurian troops who had been driven into Siberia by the invading Japanese and repatriated to Sinkiang by the Soviet authorities. During the remainder of 1933, Ma Chung-ying's forces made two further attempts to take Urumchi, and despite judicious use of his White Russian and Manchurian troops, Sheng was forced

to appeal to the Soviet Union for aid. In January 1934, Soviet military units entered Sinkiang and attacked Ma Chung-ying's cavalry with aeroplanes and, apparently, poison gas. The Muslim warlord was forced to fall back on Turfan, but instead of withdrawing to his old base in north-eastern Kansu he took the decision to try and hold southern Sinkiang.

This decision brought the Kansu Muslims into direct conflict with the Uyghur Muslims of Sinkiang, their erstwhile allies. There had been indications of such a split for some time; as soon as fighting on the northern front had become bogged down before Urumchi, units of Ma's forces had advanced into the Tarim Basin where his troops "aroused the antagonism of the Turki natives by looting and plundering" (Boorman and Howard, 464). It rapidly became clear to most of the Uyghur population (though notably not to Yulbars) that Ma was just another Kansu warlord, and not the saviour of the Muslims of Sinkiang they had hoped for. (There was never any question of Ma being viewed as a *mahdī*, and there seems to be no reason for assuming that he considered himself as such. Nyman, 101-3, is certainly mistaken in suggesting this.) The retreating Ma Chung-ying fell back on Kāshghar, where he destroyed the nascent Islamic "East Turkestan Republic"; he then transferred command of his forces to his brother-in-law, Ma Hu-shan (*Matthews'*, nos. 4310, 2161, 5630), and, in a move which still remains shrouded in mystery, crossed the frontier into the Soviet Union during July 1934. His brother-in-law, Ma Hu-shan, went on to occupy the whole of the southern rim of the Tarim Basin; here, as the "Commander-in-Chief of the 36th Division of the Kuomintang", Ma established a strange Hui-ruled fief on the borders of Tibet. Ma Hu-shan's statelet, "Tunganistan" [*q.v.*] was to endure until 1937, when his forces melted away and he took refuge in British India.

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

Bibliography: R. B. Ekvall, *Revolt of the crescent in Western China*, in *Asia and the Americas*, no. 29 (1929), 944-7, 1004-7; anon., *Recent events in Sinkiang*, in *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, xxi/1 (1934), 81-8; Feng Yu-chen, *Hsin-chiang yü Hsin-chiang shih-pien* ("Sinkiang and the Sinkiang disturbances"), in *Shih-shih yüeh-pao* (Nanking), x/2 (Feb. 1934), 79-107; anon., *The rebellion in Chinese Turkestan*, in *JRCAS*, xxii/1 (1935), 100-5; S. Hedin, *Big Horse's flight: the trail of war in Central Asia*, London 1936; G. Vasel, *Flammen in der Wüste*, Berlin 1936, Eng. tr. G. Griffin, *My Russian jailers in China*, London 1937; Nohara Shiro, *Bachuei no rireki* ("The life of Ma Chung-ying"), in *Kaikyoyen*, i/4 (1938), 1 p.; anon., *Goba renmai ni tsuite* ("The 'Five Mas'

group"), in *Kaikyo Jijo*, i/1 (1938), 12 pp.; anon., *Durchdringungspolitik in Zentralasien*, in *Berichte des Asien Arbeitskreises* (Vienna-Peking), i (1939), 5-30; Wu, Aitchen K. (Wu Ai-chen), *Turkistan tumult*, London 1940; Y. P. Mei, *Stronghold of Muslim China*, in *Asia*, xl (1940), 658-60; M. Norins, *Gateway to Asia: Sinkiang*, New York 1944, see esp. 41-5; O. Lattimore, *Pivot of Asia: Sinkiang and the Inner Asian frontiers of China*, Boston 1950, see esp. 69-72; An Ning, *Hsin-chiang nei-mu* ("The inside story of Sinkiang"), n. p. 1952; Chang Ta-chün, *Hsin-chiang chin ssu-shi nien pien-luan chih-lieh* ("A brief account of forty years' turmoil in Sinkiang"), Taipei 1954; idem, *Ssu-shi nien tung-luan Hsin-chiang* ("Forty years of turmoil in Sinkiang"), Hong Kong 1956 (the Hong Kong edition of Chang's work is considerably more extensive than the earlier Taipei edition); A. S. Whiting and Sheng Shih-ts'ai, *Sinkiang: pawn or pivot?*, Ann Arbor, Michigan 1958; J. E. Sheridan, *Chinese warlord: the career of Feng Yü-hsiang*, Stanford 1966; H. L. Boorman and R. C. Howard, *Biographical dictionary of Republican China*, New York and London 1967, see "Ma Chung-ying", also "Chin Shu-jen", "Sheng Shih-ts'ai", etc.; Yao-lo-po-shih (Yulbars Khān), *Yao-lo-po-shih hui-i lu* ("A record of the memories of Yulbars"), Taipei 1969; Chan Fook-lam (Gilbert), *The road to power: Sheng Shih-ts'ai's early years in Sinkiang, 1930-34*, in *Journal of Oriental Studies* (Hong Kong), vii (1969), 224-60; Baymirza Hayit, *Turkestan zwischen Russland und China*, Amsterdam 1971, also published in Turkish at Ankara in the same year; L. E. Nyman, *Great Britain and Chinese, Russian and Japanese interests in Sinkiang, 1918-34*, Lund 1977; J. Chen, *The Sinkiang story*, New York 1977. (A. D. W. FORBES)

MA HUA-LUNG (*Matthews' Chinese-English dictionary*, Revised American Edition 1969, characters nos. 4310, 2211, 4258), also known MA CH'AO-CHING (*Matthews'*, nos. 4310, 233, 1171), a Chinese Muslim leader and exponent of the "New Teaching" who played an important part in the great mid-13th/19th century Muslim risings against the Ch'ing dynasty.

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

In Ma Hua-lung's time, Chin-chi-p'u, said to have been a Muslim centre "for more than a thousand years" (Bales, *op. cit.* in *Bibl.*, 218), and described as the "Medina of Chinese Islam" (Wright, *op. cit.* in *Bibl.*, 111), indicating a significance secondary

only to that of Hochow (often described as the "Mecca of Chinese Islam"), was a prosperous trading centre which thrived on the tea and salt trade with Mongolia. Bales, 243, notes that "it was a purely Muslim city and no Chinese official was resident there. The officials lived at Lingchow" (a small city some 30 km. to the north).

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

It seems that, after the harsh suppression of "New Teaching" adherents in the Kansu-Chinghai borderlands resulting from the defeat of the 1196/1781 and 1198/1783 Muslim risings, the surviving "New Teaching" leaders moved eastwards towards Ninghsia. According to Fletcher (*op. cit.* in *Bibl.*, 77), it was Ma Hua-lung who made Chin-chi-p'u into the foremost "New Teaching" centre in all of China. From this bastion he was able to exercise an influence on the Chinese *umma* far in excess of that wielded by Ma Ming-hsin during his prime, for during the three-quarters of a century following the death of the latter, the "New Teaching" had spread from the Kansu-Chinghai border area across much of China. Seemingly, Ma Hua-lung played an important part in this process of proselytisation, for in a memorial addressed to the Imperial authorities at Peking requesting the prohibition of the "New Teaching", Tso Tsung-t'ang, the Ch'ing commander who eventually crushed the 1862-78 Muslim rebellion in Northwest China, complained that Ma, who styled himself the *Tsung-ta A-hung* ("General Grand *Mullā*", *Matthews'*, nos. 6912, 5943, 1, 2931), had "sent out people to spread this evil religion everywhere". According to Tso, these missionaries, known as *hai-li-fei* (*Matthews'*, nos. 2014, 3865, 1850, possibly a corruption of the Arabic *Ṣūfī* term *khālifā*, see Israeli, *op. cit.*, 1974, 298), were "disguised as businessmen" (Tso Tsung-t'ang, *Memorials*, cited in Chu, *op. cit.* in *Bibl.*, 1966, 156-8). In fact, Muslim merchants dominated the North China caravan trade, and it is more than probable that many of the "New Teaching" *hai-li-fei* were also legitimate merchants. Tso continued: "According to the testimony of lately captured Muslim rebels, there are missionaries of the New Teaching in Peking, Tientsin, Heilungkiang, Kirin, Shansi and Hupeh" (Tso, *Memorials*, *ibid.*); it is also probable that the "New Teaching" had spread across Szechwan (where it was definitely established) to Yunnan [*q.v.*] where it may have played some part in the "Panthay" [*q.v.*] Muslim rebellion of Tu Wen-hsiu [*q.v.*].

During the great Muslim rebellion of 1862-78 [see AL-ṢĪN], four main centres of Muslim power were to emerge in Northwest China (excluding only the Turkic areas of Sinkiang which were either to pass under the rule of Ya'kūb Beg [*q.v.*] of Kāshghar [*q.v.*], or to maintain a precarious independence under incompetent local leadership in Dzungaria

Chinese sources may be found in C. I. Piekens, *Chinese annals*, pp. 30-3 of his *Annotated bibliography of literature on Islam in China*, Hankow 1950; this source is especially useful for details of the 1196-9/1781-4 Muslim risings contained in the *Ta-Ch'ing Kao-tsung Shun-huang-ti shih-lu* (i.e. the official edicts of the Ch'ien-lung period). See also Wei Yüan, *Sheng-wu chi* ("History of the Imperial wars"), 1842, *chüan* 7 (cited in Ford, *op. cit.* below). For further details, see D. D. Leslie, *Islam in China to 1800: a bibliographical guide*, in *Abr-Nahrain*, xvi (1976), 25 (Section H, "Imperial Edicts"). Further primary sources, including the *P'ing-Hui chi-lüeh* ("Brief record of the pacification of the Muslims", Kansu, ca. 1196/1781) may be found in Pai Shou-i, ed. *Hui-min ch'i-i* ("The righteous uprisings of the Muslim people"), published in 4 vols., Shanghai 1952, of which vols. iii and iv refer to events in the Chinese north-west during the 18th and 19th centuries.

Secondary sources dating from the late 19th and early 20th centuries include: C. Imbault-Huart, *Deux insurrections des Mahométans du Kansou*, in *JA*, ser. 8, vol. xiv (1889), 494-525; J. J. M. de Groot, *Sectarianism and religious persecution in China*, Amsterdam 1903-4; M. Broomhall, *Islam in China: a neglected problem*, London 1910, see esp. 150-1; H. M. d'Ollone, *Recherches sur les musulmans chinois*, Paris 1911; and M. Hartmann, *Zur Geschichte des Islam in China*, Leipzig 1921. More recent works include Mu Shou-ch'i, *Kan-Ning-Ch'ing shih-lüeh* ("A brief history of Kansu, Ninghsia and Chinghai"), Lanchow 1936, *chüan* 18, p. 37; *chüan* 19, p. 6 etc. (cited in Ford, *op. cit.* below); in Arabic, Muḥammad Tawāḍu', *al-Ṣīn wa 'l-Islām*, Cairo 1945; Pai Shou-i, *Hui-hui min-tsu ti hsin-sheng* ("The rebirth of the Muslim people"), Shanghai 1951, see esp. 46-7; Chu Wen-djang, *The policy of the Manchu government in the suppression of the Moslem rebellion in Shensi, Kansu and Sinkiang from 1862 to 1878*, Ph. D. thesis, Univ. of Washington, 1955 (the greater part of this thesis was later published [see Chu, 1966], but several important appendices were omitted from the published version, most notably Supplement IV, "Ma Hua-lung and the New Sect", which may be found at 343-60 of the unpublished thesis); Mary C. Wright, *The last stand of Chinese conservatism: the T'ung-Chih restoration, 1862-1874*, Stanford 1957, repr. New York 1969, see esp. 107-13 of the 1969 edition; L. J. Schram, *The Monguors of the Kansu-Tibetan frontier*, in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, li/3 (1961), 63-5. A particularly important source is Saguchi Toru's *Jūhaci-jūkyū seiki Higashi Torukisutan shakaishi kenkyū* ("The social history of Eastern Turkestan in the 18th/19th centuries"), Tokyo 1963. Also of importance is Immanuel C. Y. Hsu's *The Ili crisis: a study of Sino-Russian diplomacy, 1781-1881*, Oxford 1965, see esp. 23-4, and 197, n. B. The most recent sources include: Chu Wen-djang, *The Moslem rebellion in Northwest China, 1862-78*, The Hague-Paris 1966; J. Ford, *Some Chinese Muslims of the seventeenth and eighteenth Centuries*, in *Asian Affairs*, lxi/2 N.S. vol. v/12 (1974), 144-56 (for Ma Ming-hsin, see esp. 153-6); R. Israeli, *Chinese versus Muslims: a study of cultural confrontation*, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of California, Berkeley 1974; J. Fletcher, *Central Asian Sufism and Ma Ming-hsin's New Teaching*, publication unknown, 1976 (?), 75-96; Israeli, *Established Islam and marginal Islam in*

China: from eclecticism to syncretism, in *JESHO*, xxi/1 (1978), 99-109. (A. D. W. FORBES)

MĀ WARĀ' AL-NAHR (A.) "the land which lies beyond the river", i.e. beyond the Oxus or Āmū-Daryā [*q.v.*], the classical Transoxiana or Transoxania, so-called by the conquering Arabs of the 1st/7th century and after in contrast to Mā dūn al-Nahr, the lands of *Khurāsān* [*q.v.*] this side of the Oxus, although the term *Khurāsān* was not infrequently used vaguely to designate all the eastern Islamic lands beyond western Persia.

1. THE NAME

The frontiers of Mā warā' al-nahr on the north and east were where the power of Islam ceased and depended on political conditions; cf. the statements of the Arab geographers on Mā warā' al-nahr in G. Le Strange, *The lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge 1905, 433-4; W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*, London 1928, 64 ff. The phrase Mā warā' al-nahr passed from Arabic literature into Persian. As late as the 9th/15th century, Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū [*q.v.*] devotes a special chapter (the last) to Mā warā' al-nahr in his geographical work. Under the influence of literary tradition, the phrase Mā warā' al-nahr was used down to quite recent times in Central Asia itself (e.g. by Bābur, in his *Bābur-nāma*, ed. Beveridge, see index; by Mīrzā Ḥaydar Dughlāt later in the 10th/16th century in his *Ta'rīkh-i Rashīdī*, tr. Eīās and Ross, *A history of the Moghuls*, London 1895, 79, 95 ff., 150, etc.; and by the Uzbek Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, cf. *Sprav. knizhka Samarkandskii oblasti*, v, 240 and *passim*), although to the people of Central Asia the lands in question were on their side of and not across the river. (W. BARTHOLD)

2. HISTORY

Pre-Islamic Transoxania comprised, in the widest sense, Soghdia (Arabic *Ṣughd* [*q.v.*], essentially the basin of the Zarafshān river) and the lands as far as the Sīr Daryā basin, northwestwards to *Kh'wārazm* [*q.v.*] and eastwards to Farghāna [*q.v.*] and across the Tien Shan Mountains into Eastern or Chinese Turkestan (on the general concept of "Turkestan", Eastern and Western, see *TURKISTĀN*). For these regions in classical times, see W. Tomaschek, in *PW*, ii, cols. 2804-13 (Baktra, Baktriane, Baktriano), iii, cols. 2406-8 (Chorasmia). All this was still largely an Iranian region, with such Middle Iranian languages flourishing there as *Kh'wārazmian* and Soghdian, both written in scripts going back to the Aramaic alphabet; Bactrian in the upper Oxus provinces of *Tukhāristān*, *Āghāniyān*, *Khuttal(ān)* and *Wakhsh* [*q.v.*], written in a modified Greek alphabet; and Khotanese and Tokharian dialects in the Tarim basin of Eastern Turkestan, written in scripts of Indian origin. In Soghdia, however, the strong cultural influence of Sāsānid Persia may have given Persian a foothold in the main cities at least. *Narshakhi* states that just after the time of the conquest of *Bukhārā* by *Qutayba b. Muslim* (sc. in ca. 94/712-13), the people there used Persian (*pārsī*) for reciting the *Qur'ān*, though no doubt Soghdian remained for some time to come the main language of daily intercourse (*Ta'rīkh-i Bukhārā*, ed. Mudarris Ridawī, Tehran 1939, 57, tr. R. N. Frye, *The history of Bukhara*, Cambridge, Mass. 1954, 48). Just over two-and-a-half centuries later, al-Mukaddasī, 335, calls the speech of *Bukhārā dari*, i.e. Persian; this must nevertheless still refer to urban speech patterns only, for Soghdian lasted much longer in the countryside.

In regard to religion, no single faith was dominant. Buddhism was still in full bloom in Eastern Turkestan and still strong in the upper Oxus provinces, where it was the faith of the northern branch of the Hephthalites [see HAYĀTILA] who put up such a strenuous resistance to the Arabs in the later 1st/7th and early 2nd/8th centuries, and where Balkh [q.v.] was still a major Buddhist centre; but it had, for some time, been waning in Soghdia. When the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang arrived in Samarkand in ca. 630, he found the Zoroastrians completely in the ascendant there and the Buddhist monasteries deserted; the restorative measures which he took can only have arrested this decline temporarily. For as in the linguistic field, cultural pressures from Sāsānid Persia must have given Zoroastrianism an access of prestige and power in Transoxania, even though direct Sāsānid military authority did not extend beyond Marw (cf. W. Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, Paris 1945, 33-5). Manicheism and other dualist faiths were tolerated, and their adherents found an especially sympathetic haven in Eastern Turkestan and among the Uyghur Turks, as numerous surviving religious texts from the Tarim basin attest; as late as ca. 372/982 the *Hudūd al-ālam*, tr. Minorsky, London 1937, II, 3, § 25.13, records the presence in Samarkand of a conventual house of the Manichaeans, *khānagāh-i Mānawiyān*, with *auditores* or *nighūshāk*. Mazdakites are mentioned also in Samarkand, and if the followers of the late 2nd/8th century heretic al-Muḳanna', the "wearers of white" (see below) were Mazdakites (or Manichaeans?), their adherents still persisted at Kish and Nakhshab in the time of the continuator of Narshakhī Ahmad b. Muḳammad b. Naṣr (*Ta'rikh-i Bukhārā*, 88-9, tr. 75). The Christian presence was strong. A bishop is mentioned at Marw in 334 A.D. and there was probably one in Samarkand by the 6th century. Nestorians, Jacobites and Melkites were all represented in Transoxania. When the Sāmānid *amir* Ismā'il b. Ahmad [q.v.] conquered Talas in 280/893, a "great church" was transformed into a mosque (*ibid.*, 102, tr. 86-7). The absence of any one preponderant faith meant that there did not exist in Transoxania a dominant priesthood as there was in Sāsānid Persia, though religious scholars (*ahbār*: al-Ṭabarī, II, 1237) are mentioned in Khwārazm at the time of Kutayba's incursions of 93/712, perhaps Zoroastrian priests; but resistance there to the Arabs was on grounds of local patriotism rather than on a religious basis.

Socially, there was an influential class of merchants in such Soghdian towns as Bukhārā, Paykand and Samarkand, which was involved in long-distance trade operations with the Turkish peoples of the Siberian steppes and with the Chinese. The Arab invasions would not seriously hamper these trade movements, and indeed, the Soghdian merchants eventually found new markets within the Islamic caliphate for the goods which they imported from Inner Asia. The landed aristocracy of *dihkāns* was dominant in the countryside and smaller towns, and the pattern of large estates in Khwārazm, along the Oxus channels and their canals, revealed by Soviet archaeology, was probably repeated in the irrigated lands of the Zarafshān valley and the upper Oxus ones. The local Iranian princes of Transoxania mentioned in the sources, such as those in rural Ilāk [q.v. in Suppl.], Shāsh [q.v.] and Farghāna, and in cities like Samarkand and Bukhārā, comprised the more powerful members of the *dihkān* class and bore Iranian regnal titles such as *ikhshīd* [q.v.] from Old Persian *khshāyathiya-*

"king, ruler"), e.g. in Soghdia and Farghāna. Such a land-owning class (which may be called, not anachronistically, one of feudal magnates) of *dihkāns* was the backbone of resistance to the Arabs, and continued to play a leading social role—eventually as an Islamised caste—in Transoxania till the end of the Sāmānid period, during which political authority was still to a considerably extent decentralised; its decline only came with the influx of Turkish steppe peoples in the 5th/11th century and after.

The Arabs who had invaded Persia and overthrown the Sāsānid empire penetrated to Tūkhāristān in 'Uthmān's caliphate, during the governorship in Khurāsān of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Āmir [q.v.], and al-Balādhurī, *Futūh*, 408, records, on the authority of Abū 'Ubayda, a plunder raid across the Oxus to Māymurgh near Samarkand in 33/653-4. It would have been obviously unwise to commit major Arab forces across the river until some progress had been made against the resistance of the Hephthalites in Cisoxania and until a key point like Balkh had been captured (first raided in 32/653, but not fully secured till the time of Kutayba, see BALKH) and the Oxus crossing-points of Āmul-i Shaṭṭ [q.v.] and Zamm taken.

In the spring of 54/674 Mu'āwiya's general 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād [q.v.] crossed the Oxus, attacked Paykand and defeated the army of the local Soghdian ruler of Bukhārā, the Bukhār-Khudā. Yazīd I's governor, Salm b. Ziyād (61-4/681-3) was the first Arab commander actually to winter across the river. Any hopes of Arab progress in Transoxania were dashed by the civil wars which broke out in the heart of the caliphate on Yazīd's death and the protracted resistance to the Umayyad government in Damascus of the anti-caliph 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, even though the Soghdian cities remained disunited and their nominal suzerain the Chinese emperor was unable, despite embassies despatched to Peking and appeals for help, to supply any assistance.

It was the great Kutayba b. Muslim al-Bāhili [q.v.] who was the first Arab general to establish a firmer Arab hold over Transoxania. Appointed governor of the east by al-Hadīdjādī in 86/705, he was to enjoy a ten years' tenure of power, spanning the caliphate of al-Walīd b. 'Abd al-Malik, a reign particularly significant for the extension of Muslim power in both east and west. Kutayba first campaigned successfully in the Upper Oxus provinces at the invitation of the ruler of Čaghāniyān, who sought aid against local rivals (86/705). Between 87/706 and 90/709 he conquered Paykand and Bukhārā, installing in the latter city a local prince Tughshāda as his vassal, and received the submission of Tarkhān of Samarkand and his successor Ghūrak. Mosques were now built in Bukhārā, Samarkand, etc., in order to encourage the implantation of Islam and the inhabitants of Bukhārā were forced to give up half the houses of the *madīna* or *shahrastān* as billets for the incoming Arab garrison; but according to Narshakhī, 57, tr. 48, Kutayba had to pay the local inhabitants two *dirhams* a time to attend the Friday prayers. It was first in 88/707 that Kutayba had to repel Turkish forces which appeared in Transoxania when the people of Bukhārā appealed to the powerful Kaḡhan of the Eastern Turks, whose name is known only in the Chinese transcription of Mo-č'ō; and a further Turkish invasion into Soghdia in 93/712, at the invitation of the people of Samarkand, repulsed by Kutayba in the following year, may be that mentioned in the early Turkish Orkhon inscriptions (Khočo-Tsaidam, Kültigin I E 39) as the one undertaken by

the prince Kültigin which penetrated as far as *Tāmir Kaplgh*, the "Iron Gate" (sc. the present Buzgala defile between *Kish* and *Tirmidh*), "in order to organise the Soghdian people" (the connection of these seems fairly certain, as proponed by Marquart and Barthold; cf. R. Giraud, *L'empire des Turcs célestes, les règnes d'Elterich, Qapghan et Bilgä* (680-734), Paris 1960, 44, 182-3, who also notes that this same inscription (Kültigin I, E 31) mentions an earlier expedition to the Iron Gate under Tonyuquq in 701). Kutayba further sent two expeditions against *Kh'wārazm* in 93/712, when the *Kh'wārazm-Shāh* was killed, although it was long before Islam became firmly implanted there [see *KH'WĀRAZM*]. His forces also campaigned in the *Sir Daryā* valley in *Ushrūsana* [q.v.] and *Shāsh*, meeting no resistance from the Turks, although the brief report in *al-Ṭabarī*, ii, 1276, of a raid by one of his commanders as far as *Kāshghar*, on the other side of the *Tien Shan*, seems improbable (see H. A. R. Gibb, *The Arab invasion of Kashghar in A.D. 715*, in *BSOS*, ii [1923], 467-74).

The Turks' ability to intervene once more in Transoxanian affairs was for a while hampered by internal disputes between the Eastern and Western Turks, but after 716, a forceful ruler, *Su-lu*, made himself leader of the Western Turks or *Türgesh*. In 106/724 he inflicted a sharp defeat, the so-called "Day of thirst", on the Arab commander *Sa'id b. 'Amr al-Ḥarashī* who had invaded *Farghāna*, in the *Sir Daryā* basin, and this reduced aggressive activity on the part of the Arabs for a decade or two. It is from these years, immediately after the fall of *Kutayba*, that there dates the important cache of documents in Soghdian, the archives of *Divāstīc*, prince of *Pandjkent* on the upper reaches of the *Zarafshān*, kept at his stronghold on *Mount Mugh*, sacked in 104/722-3 by the Arabs (*al-Ṭabarī*, ii, 1447-8; cf. A. L. Mongait, *Archaeology in the U.S.S.R.*, Moscow 1959, 289-95). In the ensuing years, the Arabs, now on the defensive, were pushed back by the joint efforts of the Soghdian princes and the Turks, so that by 110/728 the Arabs only held *Samarqand* and *Dabūsiyya*. The Arabs themselves were divided after 116/734, when the rebellion of *al-Ḥārith b. Suraydj al-Mudjāshī'i* [q.v.] broke out, first in *Ṭukhārīstān* and then in *Transoxania* (where *al-Ḥārith* allied with the *Qaghan* of the *Türgesh*, *Su-lu*), lasting for several years. There was also much discontent amongst that part of the indigenous Transoxanian population which had been converted to Islam but which nevertheless found itself still liable to pay the poll-tax for the benefit of the Arab treasury.

Arab fortunes only revived under the energetic and experienced—he had fought under *Kutayba*—governor *Naṣr b. Sayyār al-Kinānī* [q.v.] (120-30/738-48), who made a generous financial settlement for the new converts and for those inhabitants who had apostasised from Islam when Arab military control had been relaxed and looked like disappearing altogether, and who brought *al-Ḥārith b. Suraydj* to terms in 126/744. He carried Arab arms into *Farghāna* again, but spent most of his efforts in pacifying Soghdia and in conciliating its people. Arab embassies to the Chinese court were resumed by *Naṣr* after an hiatus in the period 115-23/733-41, and the regulation of commercial contacts may have been one of the motives involved (see Gibb, *Chinese records of the embassies of the Arabs in Central Asia*, in *BSOS*, ii [1923], 619-22).

Naṣr was forced to abandon both *Transoxania* and *Khurāsān* by the growing menace of the 'Abbās-

id *da'wa* under *Abū Muslim* [q.v.], and pro-'Abbāsīd governors were installed in the East from 130/748 onwards. This internal revolution amongst the Arabs must have been welcomed by the *dihkāns* of *Transoxania*, disturbed at the waning of their political and social influence through the increased momentum of conversions to Islam. In 133/750-1 there was, moreover, a pro-'Alid rising among the Arab garrison of *Bukhārā*, bloodily suppressed by the new 'Abbāsīd governor *Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ al-Khuzā'i* [q.v.]. Although the *Bukhār-Khudā* had co-operated with the Arab authorities against the insurgents, he was afterwards executed on *Abū Muslim's* orders.

Meanwhile, the dissensions into which the *Türgesh* steppe confederation had fallen in 738 with *Su-lu's* defeat in battle at the hands of the Chinese and his assassination by a rival Turkish chief, permitted a recrudescence, now on a scale much more threatening than ever before to the Arabs, of Chinese activity in Central Asia. In 748 Chinese forces captured the *Türgesh* capital of *Sūyāb*, in the *Ču* river valley to the north-east of *Farghāna*, and in 749 executed the local ruler of *Shāsh* for "the non-fulfilment of his duties as a vassal". For several decades, virtually since the first coming of the Arabs, the Soghdian rulers and the princes of *Ṭukhārīstān* (including among the latter the *Yabghu*, Arabic *Djabbūya*) had been sending embassies to China appealing for help against the invaders. Now in 750-1 the Korean general *Kao-hsien-chih* was sent by the Chinese governor of *Kuča* in Eastern Turkestan, firstly against rebels in the Pamirs region of *Gilgit* [q.v. in *Suppl.*], and then into *Farghāna*. Here the Chinese army, assisted by the Turkish *Qarluq* [q.v.], met an Arab force under *Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ* at *Athlakh* or *Atlakh* near *Talas* in 133/751, and was soundly defeated, with heavy losses of killed and captured (see D. M. Dunlop, *A new source of information on the Battle of Talas or Atlakh*, in *Ural-altäischer Jahrbücher*, xxxvi [1965], 326-30). Amongst the prisoners-of-war were Chinese artisans who are supposed to have taught the people of *Samarqand* the art of paper-making (*al-Tha'ālibī*, *Laṭā'if al-ma'ārif*, tr. Bosworth, *The book of curious and entertaining information*, Edinburgh 1968, 140, and *KĀGHAD*). This marked the end of Chinese attempts to assert their hegemony west of the *Tien-Shan*; to the subsequent entreaties of the Iranian princes of *Transoxania* and *Kh'wārazm* for help against the Arabs, the T'ang emperors, pre-occupied by succession quarrels 755-63, were compelled to return non-committal answers. Arab authority was thus made reasonable firm in *Transoxania* for the first time, since the local potentates no longer had any strong allies either in the Turkish steppes (the Eastern Turkish confederation had collapsed with the death of the *Qaghan Mo-ki-lien* in 744, to be replaced by that of the *Uyghurs*, who were essentially concerned with *Mongolia* and *Eastern Turkestan*) or in the Far East. That the masses of population in *Transoxania* were as yet far from wholly reconciled to Arab political and social domination was to be demonstrated by various outbreaks of religio-political protest in the early 'Abbāsīd period (see further on these, below), but Arab authority was by that time never seriously jeopardised.

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

idem, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*³, London 1968, 180-96; R. Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*⁴, Paris 1952, 150-72; A. D. H. Bivar, in G. Hambly *et alii*, *Central Asia*, London 1969, 63-8.

Under the first 'Abbāsids, Transoxania gradually became integrated politically as a province of the caliphate as a whole. The first governors appointed there by the victorious Abū Muslim speedily began intriguing against their patron at the instigation of the caliph Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Saffāh, who became deeply suspicious of his over-mighty subject. Abū Muslim accordingly executed Sibā' b. al-Nu'mān al-Azdī in 135/752-3 at Āmul, whilst the fugitive Ziyād b. Šāliḥ was executed, to Abū Muslim's satisfaction, by the Iranian *dihkūn* of Bārkaṭh, on the route from Samarkand to Ushrūsana. Discontent among Abū Muslim's own followers after his death at the caliph al-Manšūr's hands in 137/755, discontent which came to regard the murdered leader as a semi-divine, messianic figure who would return and establish a reign of justice (cf. G.-H. Sadighi, *Les mouvements religieux iraniens au II^e et au III^e siècle de l'hégire*, Paris 1938, 134 ff.), united sectarian Islamic and non-Islamic religious dissent with politico-social resentment at Arab domination; these combined strands made Transoxania a much-troubled region in the ensuing decades. The rapidly-changing series of Arab governors sent out to govern Khurāsān and Transoxania (see the list in Zambaur, *Manuel*, 48) were mostly intent on lining their own pockets during their expectedly brief tenure of power there rather than on trying to bring about a community of interest between the Arab central government representatives and the local populations. Several governors debased the local silver currency, although it is favourably recorded by Narshakhī that the governor Ghitrif b. 'Aṭā' [q.v. in Suppl.], appointed to Khurāsān in 175/791 by his own nephew Hārūn al-Rašhīd, introduced the useful reform of alloy *dirhams*, called *Ghitrifī*, to replace the old, largely-vanished coinage of the Bukhār-Khudās (see Barthold, *Turkestan*, 203-6).

Most of what we know about Transoxania's specific history in this period from the advent of the 'Abbāsids to the rise of the Sāmānids is concerned with various rebellions there. In the caliphate of al-Mahdī, ca. 159-60/776-7 and during the governorships of Humayd b. Kaṭṭaba al-Ṭā'ī and Abū 'Awn 'Abd al-Malik b. Yazīd, there occurred the outbreak of the *Khāridjī mawlā* Yūsuf al-Barm al-Ṭhaḳafī at Bukhārā and in the countryside of Bādghīs, and later, in the time of al-Ma'mūn, Yūsuf's grandson Manšūr b. 'Abd Allāh also rebelled; such *Khāridjī* activity was an aspect of the general vitality of *Khāridjī* doctrines in Khurāsān and Sistān at this period. More serious at the time and with a protracted aftermath was the movement of the "wearers of white garments" (*al-mubayyida, ispīdh-djāmagān*), followers of the "veiled prophet" al-Muḳanna' [q.v.], whose real name was Hāshim b. Ḥakīm or 'Aṭā', a former partisan of Abū Muslim's. The revolt, erupting during Humayd's governorship, is treated at length by Narshakhī (77-89, tr. 65-76; Barthold, *Turkestan*, 198-200; Sadighi, *op. cit.*, 163-86; B. S. Amoretti, *Sects and heresies, in Camb. hist. of Iran. iv. From the Arab invasion to the Saljuqs*, ed. R. N. Frye, Cambridge 1975, 498-503). It attracted widespread support in Soghdia, at Kish and at Nakhshab or Nasaf, whilst in Bukhārā, the son of the Bukhār-Khudā Tughshāda, Bunyāt, renounced official Islam and joined the movement. It is not easy to discern from the sources the exact nature of al-Muḳanna's

religious doctrines. He himself may have been originally a Zoroastrian, but his ideas may have come to include neo-Mazdakite elements and perhaps even Manichaean ones; and certainly, Abū Muslim, whose avatar al-Muḳanna' claimed to be, was accorded an exalted, almost divine position. The outbreak was suppressed during the governorship of al-Musayyab b. Zuhayr al-Dabbī (163-6/780-3), but the "wearers of white garments" persisted in the rural areas of Transoxania and Khurāsān for at least two centuries after this. The years 191-4/806-9 were characterised by the revolt centred on Transoxania, but with partisans joining his standard from the upper Oxus provinces of Čaghāniyān and Khuttal and from Khwārazm, of Rāfi' b. Layth, the grandson of Naṣr b. Sayyār. The motive behind this seems to have been purely personal, without any religious or ideological impulse, and doubtless the prestige of Rāfi's descent from the popular Naṣr b. Sayyār brought him support. The Arab governor of Samarkand was killed, and Rāfi' secured help from the Iranian prince of Shāsh, from the Karluḳ and the Toghuz-Oghuz Turks of the steppes and from Tibet before he submitted voluntarily to al-Ma'mūn and secured pardon (see Barthold, *Turkestan*, 200-1).

Thus intervention by the Turks in Transoxanian affairs continued during the early 'Abbāsīd period, but not on the same scale as during the Umayyad one. The disintegration of Türgesh power in the Western Turkestan steppes was followed by the ascendancy of the Toghuz-Oghuz, precursors of the Oghuz or Ghuzz [q.v.] who are mentioned in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th century Islamic sources as harrying the borders of Sāmānid Transoxania and then emerging to form the tribal backing of the Saldjūks [q.v.] when they overthrew Ghaznawid power in Khurāsān and entered northern Persia and the central lands of the Middle East. In the early 'Abbāsīd period, the Toghuz-Oghuz had their pasture grounds on the confines of Khwārazm and also along the lower Sīr Daryā. The Karluḳ, possibly the ancestors of the later Ilek Khāns [q.v.] or Karakhānids, took over the eastern Sīr Daryā basin and Semirečye (Turkish Yeti Su, "the land of the seven rivers"), acquiring in 766 Sūyāb, the former capital of the Türgesh. Islamic Transoxania suffered sporadically from their incursions, and these Turks continued also to give help on occasion to insurgent local Iranian princes and to rebels like Rāfi' b. Layth. To protect the settled agricultural lands, walls were built to the north of Bukhārā and in Shāsh; in Ilāk, in the great southern bend of the Sīr Daryā, the construction of a wall from the mountains to the river is ascribed to 'Abd Allāh b. Humayd b. Kaṭṭaba, governor of Khurāsān in 159/776 after his father's death. As shows of strength, the Arabs periodically sent expeditions into Farghāna; Ghitrif b. 'Aṭā' sent thither an army to drive out the forces of the Yabghu of the Karluḳ, and Faḳl b. Yaḥyā al-Barmakī (177-9/793-5) exacted the submission of the Afshīn or prince of Ushrūsana, who according to Gardizī, had never before acknowledged the suzerainty of any outside ruler. The caliph al-Mahdī received at one point the homage of various Central Asian rulers, amongst whom are mentioned the Ikhshīd of Soghdia, the Afshīn of Ushrūsana, the prince of Farghāna, the Yabghu of the Karluḳ, the Kaḡhan of the Toghuz-Oghuz, etc., but this cannot have meant much in practice. This was also a period when, because of the early 'Abbāsīds' dependence on their Khurāsānian guards, Transoxanian fighting men entered the caliphal army in considerable numbers; in the reign

of al-Mu'tašim, the Afshīn of Ushrūsana, Haydar, was to play a leading role in suppressing the revolt of Bābak al-Khurrāmī [q.v.] in northwestern Persia until his own spectacular fall in 226/841 [see AFSHĪN].

Of special concern to us here is the contemporary rise to power, under the overlordship of the Tāhirids, of the Sāmānids, who laid the foundations for what became a powerful amirate, at first in Transoxania and then also, in the 4th/10th century, in Khurāsān (204-395/819-1005). Whether the semi-mythical ancestor of the Sāmānids, the person given the title of Sāmān-Khudā, was really a scion of the Sāsānids or not (see Bosworth, *The heritage of rulership in early Islamic Iran and the search for dynastic connections with the past*, in *Iran*, JBIPS, xi [1973], 59-9) is impossible to decide, but the family was clearly a typical Iranian *dihkān* one hailing from Tukhāristān. A Sāmān-Khudā of the late Umayyad period is said to have accepted Islam at the hands of the governor Asad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kasrī (105-9/723-7), and in the caliphate of al-Ma'mūn, his four grandsons, Nūh, Aḥmad, Yaḥyā and Ilyās received, as rewards for their fidelity to al-Ma'mūn's interests, the governorships of Samarkand, Farghāna, Shāsh and Harāt respectively. The Harāt branch was unable to maintain power south of the Oxus, and the Sāmānids developed essentially as the dominant power in Transoxania, being designated governors, in effect independent rulers there, by the caliph in 261/875 after the downfall of the Tāhirids at the hands of the Ṣaffārids Ya'qūb and 'Amr b. Layth [q.v.]. For a detailed consideration of the Sāmānid dynasty and its history, see SĀMĀNIDS, and for the present, a useful general survey by Frye, *The Sāmānids*, in *Camb. hist. of Iran*, iv, 136-61.

Here it may merely be noted that it was a cardinal feature of Sāmānid policy, from the time of the real founder of the dynasty's fortunes, Ismā'īl b. Aḥmad (279-95/892-907) [q.v.], onwards, to maintain those frontiers of Transoxania which faced the steppes against the pagan Turks and thereby to provide a bastion against nomadic pressure from Inner Asia. Ismā'īl in 280/893 led a punitive expedition against the Karluḡ, taking an immense plunder (presumably of beasts and slaves) from them at Talas (modern Dzhambul), and he also brought to heel the prince of Ushrūsana. Other outlying Iranian principalities were however normally allowed to subsist as vassals, sending tribute and/or presents to the *amīrs*, of the Sāmānids. This was the case with the Afrīghid Khwārazm-Shāhs, the Ṣaffārids in Sīstān, the Farīghūnids in Gūzgān, the Abū Dāwūdids in Balkh, the Muḥtādīds in Čaghāniyān, etc., and whilst the *amīrs* remained vigorous and incisive, this was no source of weakness. Contemporary geographers describe the fringes of Transoxania as dotted with *ribāts* [q.v.] against the pagan Karluḡ, Oghuz and Kimāk [q.v.], where *ghāzīs* or enthusiasts for the faith, from the Transoxanian towns, could work off their energies in the defence of Islam. In Isfīdjāb [q.v. in Suppl.], on the northernmost frontier of Islam, as many as 1,700 *ribāts* are mentioned, partly manned by volunteers from Nakshab, Bukhārā and Samarkand. Even when some of these Turks had been nominally converted to Islam, *ribāts* as centres for offensive and defensive operations were still necessary; al-Muḡaddasī, 274, tells how two places on the middle Sīr Daryā, in the district of Isfīdjāb, were frontier points (*thaghrān*) against the Türkmens (*al-Turkmāniyyūn*) who had only become Muslims "out of fear". It was also from these frontier-posts that Ṣūfis and other zealots set off into the *terra*

incognita of the steppes as evangelists, such as the missionary from Nīshāpūr, one Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad al-Kalīmātī, who worked amongst the Karluḡ in the middle years of the 4th/10th century and who played some part in the conversion of the founder of the Karakhānid line, Satuḡ Bughrā Khān, the Islamic 'Abd al-Karīm (Barthold, *Turkestan*, 175-8, 254-6).

Transoxania flourished under the Sāmānids, and there was a dying-down of sectarian religious and socio-political protest movements during their time, compared with the previous period, although these did not entirely disappear. The geographers and travellers praise the ease of life there, the plentifulness of provisions, the comparatively light hand of government and incidence of taxation and tolls. There was quite a complex central administration in the capital Bukhārā, known to us from the accounts of Narshakhī and of the encyclopaedist of the sciences Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Khwārazmī [q.v.], with a cluster of *dīwāns* or government departments adjacent to the palace built in Bukhārā by Naṣr b. Aḥmad (301-31/913-43); the model for these was doubtless the 'Abbāsīd bureaucracy in Baghdād (see Narshakhī, 31-2, tr. 25-7; Bosworth, *Abū 'Abdallāh al-Khwārazmī on the technical terms of the secretary's art...*, in *JESHO*, xii [1969], 113-64). Because of the province's frontier position, the people of Transoxania are described as tough, bellicose and self-reliant; also, perhaps because of the continued social influence of the *dihkān* class, the ancient Iranian virtues of hospitality and liberality were kept up (see Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 949-1040* Edinburgh 1963, 27-34). Culturally, both the Samanids themselves and the local, petty courts of the empire encouraged the persistence of Iranian oral and literary traditions, seen in the birth and florescence of New Persian lyrical and heroic poetry (by Shahīd Balkhī, Rūdakī, Daḡīkī, etc.) which characterised the 4th/10th century and prepared the way in the early part of the following century for such figures as Firdawsī and the Ghaznavid lyric poets (see G. Lazard, *The rise of the New Persian language*, in *Camb. hist. of Iran*, iv, 595-632). At the same time, Transoxania shared to the full in the Arab-Islamic heritage of the caliphate as a whole. Several of the compilers of the canonical collections of *hadīths*, the *sunan*, were from Transoxania and Khurāsān, and their scholars played a large role in the consolidation and elaboration of orthodox Sunnī theology (*kalām*) and law (*fiqh*). Similarly, the fourth section of al-Tha'ālibī's literary anthology, the *Yatīmat al-dahr*, shows how brilliantly Arabic poetry and artistic prose were cultivated in Khurāsān, Transoxania and Khwārazm (see V. Danner, *Arabic literature in Iran*, in *Camb. hist. of Iran*, iv, 566-94; Bosworth, *The interaction of Arabic and Persian culture in the 10th and early 11th centuries*, in *al-Abḥāth*, xxvii [1978-9], 60, 68 ff.).

As in other fields, during the period 750-1000 Transoxania acquired strong economic and commercial links with the heartlands of the caliphate, including with the supreme centre of consumption, 'Irāk and its capital Baghdād. Instead of the old military systems of the Arab *muḡātīla* and then of the early 'Abbāsīds' Khurāsānian guards, the caliphs began in the 3rd/9th century to surround themselves with Turkish slave troops (see *DIARYSI*, i and *GHULĀM*, i). Hence the trade in Turkish slaves, who passed from the Inner Asian steppes through Transoxania to the slave markets there, became highly important, Turkish slaves were an integral part of the annual

tribute which the Tāhirids, whose governorate involved responsibility for Transoxania, forwarded to Baghdād; according to Ibn Khurradādhbih, 28, 20,000 were sent each year, their value amounting to 600,000 *dirhams*. In the Sāmānid period, a century or so later, al-Muqaddasī, 340, states that the Sāmānid government issued special licenses (*adjwiza*) for the transit across their lands of Turkish slave boys and collected dues for them at the Oxus crossings. The detailed list of the products of the Inner Asian steppes, the Siberian forest zone and the Volga basin given by idem, 323-6, has been conveniently translated by Barthold, *Turkestan*, 235-6. Transoxania and Khwārazm processed and sewed together the furs of the forest lands, these being highly-prized, luxury articles in Islam [see FARW], and were important centres for the manufacture of cotton and other textiles. Particularly mentioned are the silks and satin brocades of Samarkand; the towels of Karmīniya; the cloth of the village of Zandana, near Bukhārā used for the livery of the Sāmānids' palace guards; the cottons of Ṭawāwīs, also near Bukhārā; and the cotton garments of Wadhār near Samarkand. Narshakhī, 24, tr. 19-20, mentions a *ṭirāz* [*q.v.*] factory (*kārgāh*) in Bukhārā, where carpets, cloth, etc. were woven for the caliphs and which were also exported as far as Syria, Egypt and Byzantium; it may have been founded when al-Ma'mūn was governor in Marw, but by Narshakhī's time (or by that of his continuator?) was no longer in use (see R. B. Serjeant, *Islamic textiles, material for a history up to the Mongol conquest*, Beirut 1972, 92-106). Another luxury item which came into the caliphate, certainly by sea but also probably overland through Central Asia and Transoxania, was Chinese porcelain, including the "imperial" variety, *ċīnī faḡhfūrī* as the Ghaznawid historian Abu 'l-Faḡl Bayhaḡī calls it, imported in the time of Hārūn al-Raḡhīd (see P. Kahle, *Chinese porcelain in the lands of Islam*, in *Opera minora*, Leiden 1956, 354); whilst from Khwārazm, the local *bārāndī* melons were so coveted as to be exported for al-Ma'mūn and al-Wāḡhīḡ in leaden containers packed with snow (al-Tha'ālibī, tr., *The book of curious and interesting information*, 142). The direct interest of the caliphs and their ministers in Central Asia, as well as being seen in the *bayt al-ṭirāz* at Bukhārā, to which the caliphs' tax-collectors came each year to collect the stipulated taxation of the city in textiles, is paralleled by the fact, mentioned by Ibn Faḡlān, that in the opening years of the 4th/10th century, the caliph al-Muḡtadir's vizier Ibn al-Furāt [*q.v.*] had an extensive estate at Artakhushmīḡhan in Khwārazm, administered by a local Christian steward or *wakīl* (*Reisebericht*, ed. A. Z. V. Togan, Leipzig 1939, § 1, text 3-4, tr. 2-3, and Excursus 5a, 110-11).

The increasingly acute internal dissensions within the Sāmānid amirate of the later 4th/10th century, when powerful Turkish commanders like the Sīmdjūrīs, Fā'īḡ and Begtuzun secured an ascendancy in the state, making and unmaking *amīrs* at will, and when an internal financial crisis, bringing sharp increases in taxation, manifested itself, heralded the fall of the dynasty. The decisive factor here was the appearance on the northern frontiers of Transoxania, now unguarded, of the Ḳarluḡ. The Ḳarluḡ were converted to Islam in *ca.* 349/960, and from their centres at Kāshḡhar and Balāsāḡhūn [*q.v.*] (the latter in the Ču valley, perhaps near modern Frunze) began to take advantage of the amirate's weakness. Apparently with some encouragement—as, in former times, against the Arab governors—from the local

Iranian *dihkāns*, the Ḳarluḡ temporarily occupied the capital Bukhārā in 382/992. Further incursions followed, and in the end, the Ḳarakhānīds or Ilek/Ilig Khāns, as the ruling family of the Ḳarluḡ begins to be called, divided up the Sāmānid dominions with Maḡmūd of Ghazna [*q.v.*], the Ḳarakhānīds taking Transoxania and the Ghaznawīds Khurāsān (see Barthold, *Turkestan*, 246-71; idem, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, 59 ff.; Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*, 198-203).

For a detailed account of the political and dynastic changes in Transoxania over the next two centuries or so before the coming of the Mongols, see ILEK-KHĀNS and for the next wave of Inner Asian peoples to enter Semirečye and Transoxania, the Kitāi (Chinese Kī'-'tan or Liao) from the Mongolian fringes of northern China, see ḲARĀ KHITĀY; and since the history of the Great Saldjūḡs, suzerains of Transoxania in the sultanates of Malik-Shāh and Sandjar [*q.v.*], impinges on that of Transoxania, see further SALDJŪKS.

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

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

mediaeval provinces of Čaghāniyān, Khuttal and Wakhs̄h did an Iranian-speaking population persist now speaking the form of New Persian known as Tād̄jīk/Tadzhik [see IRAN. iii. Languages, in Suppl.], and living in what is now the Tadzhik SSR, their numbers amounting to under 1 3/4 millions (1970 census). It is also during these centuries of the Turkicisation of Transoxania that the region becomes known, at least in popular parlance, as Turkistān [q.v.].

Transoxania and Eastern Turkestan or Kāshgharia were of course the first Islamic lands which Čingiz Khān encountered when he came westwards with the Mongol hordes. Balāsāghūn [q.v.], the main urban centre of Semirečye, was occupied after it had already suffered a severe plundering by the Karā Khitāy. Bukhārā was ravaged in 616/1220, and soon afterwards, Otrār or Utrār [q.v.], the former Fārāb [q.v.], in the Sīr Daryā basin, and Samarkand were attacked before Čingiz pushed on into Khurāsān in pursuit of the Khwārazm-Shāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad [see KHWĀRAZM-SHĀHS]. Gurgāndj [q.v.] in Khwārazm was bravely defended, but fell to the Mongols (618/1221) and was later named Urgenč. The Great Khān Ögedey (1227-41) appointed governors in Transoxania for Nakhshab, Bukhārā and Samarkand, and the sedentary indigenous population was at the beginning of his reign ruled by his representative Maḥmūd Yalawač Khwārazmī [q.v.], appointed to collect the taxation there. Djuwaynī praises Maḥmūd Yalawač's just rule and that also of his son Mas'ūd Beg [q.v.], stating that Bukhārā reached its former level of prosperity (the latter governor was, for instance, the founder of the Mas'ūdiyya madrasa in Bukhārā), though in fact there was a popular, anti-Mongol rebellion there led by one Maḥmūd Tārābī, only ended by the appearance of a large Mongol army (636/1238-9) (see Barthold, *Turkestan*³, 381-519; Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*, 293 ff., 324-8; Hambly, *The career of Chingiz Khan and The Mongol empire at its zenith*, in *Central Asia*, 86-113).

Transoxania, together with those steppe lands to the north henceforth to be known as Moghōlistān [q.v.] or Mughulistān, came within the ulus or patrimony of Čingiz's second son Čaghatay, together with Eastern Turkestan (Khwārazm came within the ulus of Djoči, the eldest son, together with western Siberia and South Russia); but the Čaghatay khānate was not properly constituted till some time after Čaghatay's own death in ca. 1241. Čaghatay and his descendants took little interest in the sedentary and urban life of Transoxania. Pre-Mongol Turkish landowners and chiefs, the successors of the Iranian *dihkhāns*, remained influential in the countryside; the descendants of the Karakhānids remained in power in Farghāna, it seems (Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, 118-19). In Moghōlistān, to the north of the Ili river, there was a distinct decline of urban life in favour of pastoralisation (see *ibid.*, 149-53). Urban traditions in Transoxania were much stronger, and especially notable in the towns there is the prominent role, from Karakhānid times onwards, of local Ḥanafī religious leaders functioning as headmen (*ru'asā'*, sing. *ra'īs*), usually with the title of *šadr* or *šadr-i d̄jahān*. Leaders with this title are found in Bukhārā, Samarkand, Khudjand, Uzgend, Shāsh and Almāgh; the best-known of these were the Āl-i Burhān in Bukhārā (till the revolt of Maḥmūd Tārābī in 636/1238) and their successors, the Āl-i Maḥbūbī (till the mid-8th/14th century) (see O. Pritsak, *Āl-i Burhān*, in *Isl.*, xxx

[1952], 81-96, and *šADR*). Because of this lack of interest in the settled lands on the part of the Čaghatayid khāns, the nomadic traditions of the Mongols lasted longer amongst them, as also amongst the Golden Horde in South Russia and the Kīpčak steppes [see *DASHI-TI KĪPČAK* in Suppl.], than in the Persia of the Il-Khānids or the northern China of the Great Khāns. The Čaghatayid khāns' favoured encampments were in Semirečye, in the Ili basin, with the town of Almāgh [q.v.], between the Tien-Shan and Lake Balkash, as their administrative centre; this town flourished and is favourably described by western travellers to the Great Khāns' court until it was destroyed in the civil strife amongst the Mongols in the 8th/14th century. Kebek (ca. 1318-26), though still, like the previous khāns, resistant to Islam, moved his capital to Transoxania proper and built a palace near Nakhshab in the Kashka Daryā valley, although this did not entail renunciation of the nomadic life; from the Mongol term for "palace", *karshi*, the nearby town of Nakhshab came to receive the name which it still bears today, that of Karshī/Karshi [see *KARSHI*]. Kebek's move must nevertheless have favoured the eventual conversion of the Čaghatayid khāns to Islam, from the time of Tarmashīrīn onwards (1326-34). Čaghatayid rule lasted in Transoxania till the rise of Tīmūr (see below), and in other parts of Central Asia till after then, but Tīmūr's successes were facilitated by increased disunity amongst the Čaghatayid family, with Čaghatayid puppet rulers placed on the throne by Turkish *amīrs*. For an account of the khānate, see ČAGHATAY KHĀN and ČAGHATAY KHĀNATE;; Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, 153 ff., 169-72; Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*, 397-420; Hambly, *The Chaghatay khanate*, in *Central Asia*, 127 ff.

Tīmūr, a Barlas Turk from Kish in Transoxania, succeeded by force of arms to the Čaghatayid heritage there. In 771/1370 he became *de facto* ruler of Transoxania, ruling in the name of fainéant descendants of Ögedey, sc. Soyurghatmīsh (771-90/1370-88) and then his son Maḥmūd (770-?816/1388-?1413). He linked himself by marriage to the Čaghatayid royal house, including to a daughter of Khidr Khōdja (d. 801/1399) of Moghōlistān, who was reputedly a son of the last significant Čaghatayid khān Tughluq Tīmūr (760-71/1359-70). Under the rule of Tīmūr's descendants, above all, that of Shāhrukh (807-50/1405-47), Transoxania enjoyed much material prosperity, with Samarkand and Bukhārā becoming lively centres of artistic and literary life, of painting and book-production, and of poetry in both Persian and in Eastern Turkish or Čaghatay. Samarkand was the city which Tīmūr preferred to all others as his main capital. European travellers like the Spanish envoy Clavijo (1403) describe the splendour of his court, and fine buildings in Samarkand, of which the Gūr Amīr mausoleum and the Bibī Khānum mosque survive, attest the high aesthetic level of early Tīmūrid architecture. The reign of Tīmūr's grandson Ulugh Beg [q.v.] (ruler in Transoxania from 814/1411, at first as Shāhrukh's deputy, to 853/1449) is associated with his foundation of a short-lived observatory in Samarkand and the compilation of astronomical tables (see Barthold, *Ulugh-Beg*, tr. V. and T. Minorsky, in *Four studies on the history of Central Asia*, ii, Leiden 1958, 129-34). As his second capital, Tīmūr developed Shahr-i Sabz in the Kashka Daryā valley, in the heart of the area of the Barlas Turks and near his own birthplace, starting there the construction of impressive buildings, including his own tomb (see Barthold, *Shahr-i*

Sabz from Tīmūr to Ulūgh Beg, tr. J. M. Rogers, in *Iran, JBIPS*, xvi [1978], 103-26, xviii [1980], 121-43). Popular Islam, in the form of a cultivation of Sūfī mysticism and the growth of a network of dervish orders, especially flourished in Transoxania during Čaghatayid and Tīmūrid times, and the *shaykh*s and their orders enjoyed the patronage of the Tīmūrid rulers. Thus the Naqshbandī *shaykh* Khwādja 'Ubayd Allāh Ahrār (806-95/1404-90) strengthened the nascent *ṭarīqa* in Transoxania, benefiting particularly from the favour of Tīmūr's great-grandson Abū Sa'īd and his son Sulṭān Aḥmad; the Naqshbandiyya were henceforth to play a major role in the history of Islam in Central Asia [see AHRĀR, KHWĀDJĀ, in Suppl.]. Meanwhile, the Čaghatayids managed to survive during these years in the lands beyond Transoxania, and under Esen Buqa II (833-67/1429-62) flourished in Moghōlistān and Eastern Turkestan, being hostile however to the later Tīmūrids. For the detailed history of this period, see Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, 165-84; Grousset, *op. cit.*, 486-546, 568-80; Mahin Hajianpur, *The Tīmūrid empire*, in *Central Asia*, 150-62; TĪMŪR and TĪMŪRIDS..

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

Politically and diplomatically, Sunnī Transoxania under the Uzbeks was in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries frequently involved in warfare with the powerful and aggressive Shī'ī monarchy of Šafawid Persia. As so many earlier Turco-Mongol dynasties had done, the Shaybānids coveted the rich province of Khurāsān, and invaded it on several occasions. But Muḥammad Shaybānī (905-16/1500-10) and successors of his like Abu 'l-Ghāzī 'Ubayd Allāh (940-6/1534-6) failed to overcome the experienced troops of Shāh Ismā'īl and Shāh Ṭahmāsp, who had a greater appreciation of the value of the modern weapon of firearms and who had seasoned troops in their Kīzılbaşh Türkmens and then in their Georgian, Armenian, etc., slave guards. The long-term result of this warfare was the virtual sealing-off of Transoxania from the rest of the Islamic world through the erection by the Šafawids of this bulwark on their northeastern frontier. Although Turks

from Central Asia and Afghāns streamed into Muslim India as mercenaries, adventurers, etc., the traffic was largely one-way. Hence Transoxania became culturally introverted and impoverished, since the steppelands of South Russia and western Siberia were by the 17th century beginning to come under Russian, Christian control, and the popular Islam of such orders as the Yasawiyya, the Čishtiyya and the Naqshbandiyya, though intense in religious fervour and emotion, was weak in intellectual content. Only in the sphere of Eastern Turkish or Čaghatay literature may it be said that Transoxania made a significant contribution to the cultural stock of Eastern Islam at this time. It was a flexible and expressive enough language for Bābur [*q.v.*] to write his memoirs in it; to produce a lively folk-poetry, seen e.g. in the verses of the 18th century Göklen Türkmen bard Makhdūm Kūlī; and to give rise to a genre of historiography amongst the Shaybānids, the Dīānids or Ashtarkhānids and the Manglts of Bukhārā and the 'Arabshāhids of Khīwa in the former Khwārazm, although such outstanding figures as the 10th/16th century Shaybānid historian Hāfiz Tanīsh [*q.v.* in Suppl.] continued to write for preference in Persian. For the detailed history of the Shaybānids, see Hambly, *The Shaybanids*, in *Central Asia*, 163-74; Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, 185 ff.; and SHAYBĀNIDS.

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

The history of these khānates can be followed under BUKHĀRĀ, KHWĀRAZM, KHĪWA, KHOḲAND; see further DĪĀNIDS, KUNGRĀT, MANGĪTS, and also INAḲ in Suppl.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C. E. BOSWORTH)

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

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

I. HYDROMANCY .

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

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

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

ASSISTED BY F. TH. DIJKEMA, M^{LLE} M. LEFORT AND M^{ME} S. NURIT

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

SUPPLEMENT

FASCICULES 3—4

BASBĀS — DJAWHĀR



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1981

Anwarī and Rashīd-i Waṭwāt [*q.v.*], who seem to have ignored him rather disdainfully. Djamāl al-Dīn's ascetic ideas—including the idea of renunciation—are best presented in the *kaṣīdas* which he wrote in the fashion of Sanā'ī, though these are far inferior to Sanā'ī's ones. His *Diwān*—comprising *kaṣīdas*, quatrains, and *ghazals*—contains no less than 10,000 verses and displays the lucid and flowing 'Irākī style. Djamāl al-Dīn is said to have died either in 588/1192 or in 600/1203, the former being more likely.

Bibliography: Waḥīd-i Dastgirdī, *Diwān-i Ustād Djamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Razzāk Işfahānī* (with biographical introduction), Tehran 1320/1941; 'Awfī, *Lubāb al-adāb*, ed. Sa'īd Nafīsī, Tehran 1335/1956, 759-60; Badī' al-Zamān Furuzān-Far, *Sukhan va sukhavarān*,² Tehran 1350/1971, 547-54; J. Rypka *et alii*, *History of Iranian literature*, Dordrecht 1968, 213-14; idem, in *Cambridge history of Iran*, v, 584-5.

(A. H. ZARRINKOOB)

DJAMĀL KARSHĪ, sobriquet of ABU 'L-FADL DJAMĀL AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD B. 'UMAR B. KHĀLID, scholar and administrator in Turkeṣtān during the Mongol era. He was born at Almalgh around 628/1230-1, his father a *ḥāfiẓ* of Balāsāghūn and his mother originating from Merw. He enjoyed the patronage of the local Turkish dynasty founded at Almalgh [*q.v.*] by Būzār (or Uzār), and obtained a position in the chancellery there. In 662/1264, however, he was obliged to leave Almalgh, and for the remainder of his life resided at Kāshghar, though travelling widely in western Turkeṣtān.

In 681/1282 he composed a Persian commentary (*ṣurāḥ*) on the great lexicon *al-Şihāh* of Djawharī [*q.v.*], subsequently adding to it a historical and biographical supplement. Djamāl Karshī's *Mulḥakāt al-Şurāḥ* is in fact the only historical source we possess emanating from the Central Asian state founded by Kaydu [*q.v.*]. Extracts of the work, which includes particularly valuable sections on the Karakhānids [see ILEK-KHĀNS] and the Mongol rulers of Turkeṣtān [see ĆAGHATAY KHĀNATE], surveys of various Central Asian cities, and biographies of local divines, were edited by Barthold in *Turkestan*, Russ. ed., i, 128-52. The *Mulḥakāt* was completed soon after the accession of Kaydu's son Ćapar [*q.v.*] in 702/1303, the latest date mentioned.

The date of Djamāl Karshī's death is unknown. The surname is due to his connection with the rulers of Almalgh (*karshī* = "palace"), and is not a *nişba* from *Kuraysh* as was formerly supposed.

Bibliography: V. V. Barthold, in *Zapiski Vostočnogo Otdeleniya Imperatorskogo Russkogo Arkheologičeskogo Obščestva*, xi (1897-8), 283-7; idem, *Turkestan*³, 51-2; Brockelmann, I, 296, S I, 528; H. F. Hofman, *Turkish literature*, iii/1, 3, Utrecht 1969, 84-9, with full MS references.

(P. JACKSON)

AL-DJĀMI'Ā AL-'ARABIYYA, the Arab League. Established at the end of the Second World War, this reflects the desire to renew the original unity, a desire which has continued to be active in Muslim communities following the decline and subsequent collapse of the Arab-Islamic empire.

It was during the final years of the 19th century and before the First World War that Arab nationalists became aware of their national homogeneity, based on a common language and destiny, and on a similar way of life and culture (*ḥawmiyya* [*q.v.*]).

Egypt, reverting to the cause of Arabism between the two World Wars, in order to put an obstacle in

the way of Hāshimite designs (a plan for a Greater Syria conceived at 'Ammān, or for a Fertile Crescent, put forward by Baghdād) took the initiative of assembling in Alexandria representatives of the Arab States regarded as being independent. This meeting, marked by the signing of a protocol (7 October 1944), laid the foundations of a unity which was ratified the following year in Cairo, where on 22 March 1945 the Pact of the Arab League was signed by Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan and Yemen.

Subsequently, the League has been joined by the following countries: Libya (1953), Sudan (1956), Tunisia and Morocco (1958), Kuwait (1961), Algeria (1962), South Yemen (1967), the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Bahrayn and 'Umān (1971), Mauritania and Somalia (1974) and Djibouti (1977). Furthermore, the Palestine Liberation Organisation has been admitted, first in the capacity of an observer (1965), then as a full member (1976).

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

The components of the Organisation are currently the following:

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

1. Cairo (13-17 January 1964).
2. Alexandria (5-11 November 1964).
3. Casablanca (13-18 January 1965).
4. Khartoum (29 August-2 September 1967).
5. Rabat (21-23 December 1969).
6. Algiers (24-29 November 1973).
7. Rabat (26-29 October 1974).
8. Cairo (25-26 October 1976).

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

— Five other councils, at ministerial level (common defence, economics, information, health, youth) were instituted in 1950.

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

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

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

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

— 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Azzām Pasha (March 1945-October 1952),

— 'Abd al-Khālīk Ḥassūna (October 1952-May 1972).

— Maḥmūd Riyād (since 1 June 1972).

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