

ISSN 1226-4490

*International
Journal of
Central
Asian Studies*

Volume 1 1996

**Editor in Chief
Choi Han-Woo**

**The International Association of Central Asian Studies
Institute of Asian Culture and Development**

Muslim Saints in the 14th to the 16th Centuries of Eastern Turkestan*¹⁾

Ho-dong Kim (Seoul National University)

Introduction

The Muslim mystics, called *ṣūfī*, have been one of the most crucial factors in understanding the historical development of the post-Islamic Eastern Turkestan. First of all, the Islamization of this region owed much to their activities, so, in this respect, differs from what happened in Western Turkestan where the military conquest of the Arabs paved the way. Also were their works the conversions of a Qarakhanid Sâtuq Boghrâ Khan and a Moghul Tûghluq Timûr Khan which, though being tinged with legendary stories, have been widely regarded as turning-points in the Islamization of this region. Even after Islam took the firm hold over this area they were very active in religious as well as in secular realms, and around the 1680s they succeeded in pushing out Moghul khans and proclaiming themselves king under the patronage of the nomadic Jungars. During the period of the Manchu Qing occupation, lasting more than a century until the great Muslim rebellion exploded in 1864, the sufis had never stopped in raising the banner of 'holy war' against the infidel dynasty.

It is not strange, therefore, that not a few scholars in the past, such as M.Hartmann and R.B.Shaw, paid their attentions to the activities of the Muslim mystics in this region.¹⁾ However, their emphasis lay primarily upon the Naqshbandiyya which may be called a kind of 'major' sufi tradition in Eastern Turkestan. Recently scholars began to show their interests to some 'minor' traditions like the Katakīyya²⁾ and the Uwāsiyya.³⁾ And popular cults centering around local mausoleums (*mazar*) also became the object of study.⁴⁾

The conflict between these two different traditions in Eastern Turkestan — the encroachment of the Naqshbandiyya and the reaction of the sufis belonging to 'minor' local paths already active there — is an interesting topic to pursue. I described earlier one expression of this conflict through the analysis of the cult of Alp Ata in Turfan,⁵⁾ and here I hope to illuminate this topic further by examining the Katakī's and the Uwāsi's who were quite influential at the Moghul court in the later halves of the 14th and 16th centuries respectively. Under such a context their relations with the nomadic rulers as well as the sedentary people will be examined too.

1. The Katakī Sufis

Mirza Muḥammad Ḥaydar, one of the most celebrated historians in Central Asia, begins his *Tārīkh-i rashīdī* (hereafter abbreviated to TR) with the story of Tûghluq Timûr's conversion to Islam:

One day when Tughluq Timur Khān was feeding his dogs with swine's flesh, Shaikh Jamāl-ud-Dīn was brought into his presence. The Khān said to the Shaikh: "Are you better than this dog or is the dog better than you?" The Shaikh replied: "If I have faith I am the better of the two, but if I have no faith this dog is better than I am." The Khān was much impressed by these words, and a great love for Islām took possession of his heart.⁸⁾

Although Muḥammad Ḥaydar calls Tūghluq Timūr "khan", he was not yet enthroned at that time; he just promised that he would embrace Islam when he became khan. Jamāl al-Dīn⁷⁾ died soon after his encounter with Tūghluq Timūr, and his son Arshad al-Dīn⁸⁾ visited and converted Tūghluq Timūr who then became khan. Thus "the lights of Islam dispelled the shades of Unbelief. Islam was disseminated all through the country of Chaghatāi Khān."⁹⁾

Then what kind of sufis Jamāl al-Dīn and Arshad al-Dīn were? On this question we can find the most reliable and oldest information in TR.¹⁰⁾ According to this, when Chinggis Khan conquered Bukhara, he put to death "the last *mujtahid*" Ḥāfiẓ al-Dīn Kabīr Bukhārī with other religious leaders in the city and brought Bukhārī's brother, Shujā' al-Dīn Maḥmūd, to Qaraqorum. Shujā' al-Dīn died there,¹¹⁾ but his sons (or descendants) escaped to Lop-Katak which was located between Turfan and Khotan. Although the author's informant, himself one of the descendants of Arshad al-Dīn named Khwāja Aḥmad, told the author how many generations had lived there¹²⁾ and what their names had been, the author recollects that he forgot all the details but the name of Jamāl al-Dīn who was the last of the generations.

Jamāl al-Dīn preached Islam to the people in Lop-Katak, but they did not listen to him. It caused a divine fury, and the city was buried by the sandstorm. Jamāl al-Dīn and his son Arshad al-Dīn escaped the city with a divine ordinance and came to Ay Kōl¹³⁾ situated near Aqsu. There they met Tūghluq Timūr who gave a promise to become a Muslim when he was enthroned. However, Jamāl al-Dīn died before he became khan, and Arshad al-Dīn, following the will of the deceased, visited Tūghluq Timūr Khan in 1353-54. The Khan, being reminded of his own promise and persuaded by Arshad al-Dīn, finally became Muslim with a great number of nomads.

Although the story of Tūghluq Timūr's conversion has been fairly well-known among the Central Asian people who have revered him, together with a Qarakhanid ruler Sātuq Boghrā Khan who had initiated the conversion to Islam about four centuries ago,¹⁴⁾ as one of the most distinguished Muslim rulers in this region, we find in this story some ambiguities because historical as well as legendary aspects are inseparably mixed in it. To take an example, his conversion caused by a short remark by Arshad al-Dīn is too abrupt for us to be persuaded. One of such ambiguities is the question to which sufi path Jamāl al-Dīn and Arshad al-Dīn belonged. Since the later half of the last century several scholars have put forward various hypotheses to this question.

Ch.Ch.Valikhanov who visited Kashgharian cities during the years of 1858-59 stated that "the present Kashgharian khojas come [by a direct line] from the Shaykhs Dzhudzhag and Rashid-eddin" and that these

two shaykhs, father and son, converted Tūghluq Timūr to Islam. He also adds that they were the descendants of Fāṭima, the Prophet Muḥammad's daughter.¹⁵⁾ Here "Shaykhs Dzhudzhag and Rashid-eddin" seem to designate Shujā' al-Dīn Maḥmūd and Arshad al-Dīn, but, as has been explained above, neither was Shujā' al-Dīn the father of Arshad al-Dīn nor did he make any contribution to the conversion of Tūghluq Timūr. Although we do not know on which basis he said they were the direct ancestors of "the present Kashgharian khojas", i.e. the descendants of the famous Naqshbandī master Makhdūm-i Aẓam, his proposal apparently had its followers. V.V.Grigor'ev asserted that "Khan Khoja" who led the 1864 Kucha rebellion was one of the khwājas of the Black-Mountaineer (*Qarataghliq*) party, and his assertion was repeated by D.I.Tikhonov.¹⁶⁾ This party was one of the two competing groups formed by the descendants of Makhdūm-i Aẓam, and "Khan Khoja" was apparently the title of Khwāja Rāshidīn who was Arshad al-Dīn's descendant. If we accept the assertions of Valikhanov and Grigor'ev, then Makhdūm-i Aẓam and Arshad al-Dīn should belong to the same family. However, this is out of the question.

Later in 1962 another Russian scholar V.P.Iudin supposed that the Kuchean khwājas belonged to the Kubrawiyya because they were the descendants of Abū Ḥafẓ Kubrā Bukhārī, who, according to him, was the eponymous founder of that sufi path.¹⁷⁾ His assumption is wrong on two grounds. First, he probably misread the name Abū Ḥafīẓ al-Dīn Kabīr Bukhārī as Abū Ḥafẓ Kubrā Bukhārī, and, secondly, the founder of the Kubrawiyya is not Abū Ḥafẓ Kubrā Bukhārī but Najm al-Dīn Kubrā who died in 1221 when the Mongols sacked Khwārezm.¹⁸⁾ His tomb is now found in Uzgen,¹⁹⁾ while the mausoleum of Abū Ḥafīẓ al-Dīn Kabīr Bukhārī is located in Bukhara.²⁰⁾

Recently a Japanese scholar M.Hamada pointed out the remarks in TR that Khwāja Aḥmad, who was a descendant of Arshad al-Dīn and, at the same time, an informant of the author of that work, belonged to *Silsila-i Khwājagān*, i.e. the Naqshbandiyya, and that Khwāja Tāj al-Dīn, another descendant of Arshad al-Dīn, was a disciple of Khwāja Nāṣir al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh al-Aḥrār (alias Ḥaḍrat-i 'Ishān, d. 1490) who was one of the most renowned Naqshbandī shaykhs. And he, from these remarks, concluded that "it is beyond reasonable doubt that they, as a whole, were charter members of the order of the Naqshbandiyya".²¹⁾ It seems that "they" here is meant to be the two Kuchean khwājas mentioned in TR, and his conclusion should be accepted.

The question is, however, how about other Kuchean khwājas. Khwāja Jamāl al-Dīn and Arshad al-Dīn prior to those two khwājas, for instance, were the Naqshbandīs too? There are two extant hagiographies on these early Kuchean khwājas, *Tadhkirat al-irshād* and *Tadhkira-i Haḍrat-i Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Katakī*. Surprisingly, these two works, describing the activities of the early Kuchean khwājas, showed such a strong anti-Naqshbandī attitude that it is hard to believe that they were the products within the Naqshbandī circle. Moreover, while in many parts based on the descriptions of TR, they do not mention the names of Khwāja Aḥmad and Khwāja Tāj al-Dīn. We will examine the contents of the two works later in detail, but here it is sufficient to say that the contents of these two works make us hesitate to regard the first Kuchean khwājas, i.e. the Katakīs, as Naqshbandīs.

There is another claim that Jamāl al-Dīn belonged to the Uwaysiyya. *Tadhkira-i Boghrā Khān* (TBK)²²⁾ which is the collection of Uwaysī sufis lists him as one of the Uwaysīs. This work contains many sufis who “never existed” and thus is regarded as “a product of the imagination”.²³⁾ Since the author's aim of writing that work was to enhance the status of the religious circle to which he belonged, his classification of many sufis as Uwaysīs is quite arbitrary and unreliable. So we cannot readily accept his claim that Jamāl al-Dīn was an Uwaysī sufi. However, the fact that he was classified as an Uwaysī suggests that he did not belong to any well-known sufi path. The term Uwaysī stemmed from Uways al-Qaranī who is supposed to have been a contemporary of the Prophet living in Yemen. Muḥammad never saw him but said “The breath of the Merciful comes to me from Yemen.” Uways al-Qaranī “became, for the later Sufis, the prototype of the inspired Sufi who has been guided solely by divine grace”.²⁴⁾ In other words, an Uwaysī saint was “the mystic who has attained illumination outside the regular mystical path and without the mediation and guidance of a living sheikh”,²⁵⁾ or “dervishes who had no direct initiator”.²⁶⁾ The author of TBK also defines the Uwaysīs as those who were guided by and obtained illumination through the noble spirits of deceased prophets or saints.²⁷⁾

The preceding discussion shows that the Katakī sufis cannot be regarded the Naqshbandīs, the Kubrawīs, or the Uwaysīs. Then, returning back to the original question, to what kind of sufi path did they belong? I think that there exists a problem in this question itself. In other words, I suggest that they were not members of any hitherto known path but just independent, wandering, individual dervishes. What does it mean that all the available sources, to begin with TR, have no mention of their path? It simply means that they did not belong to any path. There is one more, although indirect, evidence supporting this point. One of the important elements in sufi biographies (*tadhkira*) is “genealogy”, called *nisbat* or *silsila*. There are two types of “genealogy”: one is the “physical” (*nisbat-i šūrī*), and the other is the “spiritual” (*nisbat-i mānāvī*). The former denotes one's family genealogy, and the latter contains the master-disciple chains. However, strangely enough, the biographies of Jamāl al-Dīn or Arshad al-Dīn lack their “spiritual genealogy,” and what we have is only the “physical genealogy,” which is quite strange if they belonged to a well-known path.

Now let us go back to the story of Tūghluq Timūr's conversion described in TR and analyze its historical meaning. There we can find a typical example of wandering individual saints' converting nomadic chiefs. First of all, there is an element of miracle-working (*karāmat*).²⁸⁾ In Lop-Katak Jamāl al-Dīn foresaw the fury of God; and his son Arshad al-Dīn, at the court of Tūghluq Timūr, was confronted with a Moghul wrestler who could “lift up a two year old camel” but, to everyone's surprise, “struck the Infidel full in the chest, and he fell senseless”.²⁹⁾ Secondly, we can see individual sufis' flexible attitude toward “uncivilized” infidels. As the quotation shows, what Jamāl al-Dīn stressed to the uncouth nomad who was feeding his dog with “swine's flesh”, detested most by the Muslims, was nothing but “faith” (*īmān*). And when he explained what the faith is, he did not bother Tūghluq Timūr with sophisticated theories or refined Quranic definitions, but gave a simple simile that a man with faith is better than a dog. Moreover, according to TR, what Arshad al-Dīn required from Tūghluq Timūr to be a Muslim was minimal: declaration, ablution, circumcision, and haircut.³⁰⁾ Declaration, or *shahāda*, is uttering that “There is no God but Allāh, and Muḥammad is His messenger”, which

is the foremost condition for any one to become a Muslim. The other three were necessary for one to have the appearance of a Muslim.

Thus, the sufi saint achieved his goal of converting infidels. However, why a nomadic ruler Tūghluq Timūr decided to become a Muslim? Their meetings and dialogues with him, which was supposed to make him deeply moved, and their miracle-workings do not seem to be enough evidence to answer that question. We may well look into the political situation in which he was found at that time. In the middle of the 14th century the Chaghatay Khanate were hopelessly divided among tribal chieftains and khans had no power to prevent this centrifugal tendency. Although, Tūghluq Timūr was enthroned later, it was Bulaji, the chief of the Dughlat tribe, who found and made him khan. It is not certain how much power he could wield at first, but the fact that we know nothing of his activities between 1348 (his enthronement) and 1360 (the beginning of his expedition to Māwarā' al-Nahr) suggests that he probably had been merely a nominal ruler.

This view is supported by the procedure he converted nomadic chiefs after his own conversion. TR writes that 120,000 persons became Muslim in a day.³¹⁾ But its description also betrays that he met a strong opposition. When he was going to persuade nomadic chiefs, he decided to "interview the princes one by one" and to kill those who refused to be converted as "heathens and idolaters". In other words, he could not proclaim his conversion in public and enforce the nomads to follow his step. Moreover, a certain Churās refused to follow the khan's example. As was mentioned earlier, his mind could be changed only by Arshad al-Dīn's "miraculous power". In this respect Tūghluq Timūr's hold over the tribal chieftains seemed to be quite limited.³²⁾

However, he finally turned into a mighty conqueror and launched a series of military expeditions against Western Turkestan from 1360. He succeeded in strengthening his monarchical power by overcoming the centrifugal tendency of the nomadic tribes and remolding them into a powerful military machine. How could he accomplish this? The scanty information in our hands does not give an definitive answer, but the acceptance of Islam seems to have been one of the contributing factors, providing him with the ideology for unity. Chronology confirms this assumption: Tūghluq Timūr became khan in 1348, converted to Islam in 1354, and began the western expedition in 1360. When he drove his army toward Māwarā' al-Nahr, he was no longer a nominal ruler but a mighty conqueror.

The conversion of Tūghluq Timūr provides a good example of a wandering sufi and a nomadic ruler having a mutually beneficial relation with each other. The one achieved his religious zeal and the other was provided with an unifying ideology. Now let us see how this relation changed when the Naqshbandiyya, a well-organized, renowned, and international sufi path, broadened its influence in Eastern Turkestan.

2. The Katakis, the Naqshbandis, and the Forgery of Genealogies

We do not know about Arshad al-Dīn's activities after his conversion of Tūghluq Timūr for TR is silent on this point, but it is certain that he settled down in the vicinity of Kucha.³⁹⁾ Apparently the religious influence of the Katakī sufis decreased gradually. Uways who became khan in 1417 after killing his cousin, Naqsh-i Jahān,³⁴⁾ was a follower of Muḥammad Kāshānī whose spiritual chains went back to Khwāja Ḥasan and Bahā' al-Dīn al-Naqshband. Muḥammad Kāshānī was undoubtedly one of the Naqshbandī sufis whose influence began to increase in Central Asia from the first half of the 15th century. However, the Naqshbandiyya was not the dominant path yet, since the Yesevī and the Katakī sufis still had a considerable number of followers.³⁵⁾

The Naqshbandīs took a firm control over Moghulistan from the reign of Yūnus who became khan in 1468-1469. After the death of his father, Uways, he competed with his brother Esen Buqa but, being defeated, fled to the Timurids. Then he became a student of Sharaf al-Dīn Yazdī, the author of *Zafar-nāma* and a towering intellectual figure at that time. When he returned to Moghulistan with this educational background and regained the throne after the death of Dūst Muḥammad Khan, he tried to stay away from the wandering life in the steppe and settle down in city for a refined urban life. His attempt was frustrated by the fierce defiance of the nomadic Moghuls and he had to swear never to stay in the city.³⁶⁾ Eventually, however, he could not be the same kind of Muslim as his great-grandfather Tūghluq Timūr.

The later half of the 15th century was the period during which the predominance of the Naqshbandiyya was being established under the leadership of Khwāja Aḥrār. Most of the Central Asian rulers at that time recognized this charismatic figure and kept one of his *khallifas* ('representative') in their courts.³⁷⁾ Muḥammad Qādī was sent to the Moghul Khanate and there he exercised a great influence on many Moghul nobles. Muḥammad Ḥaydar elucidates this point vividly in his work.³⁸⁾ In later period the activities of this path were strengthened much more, and from the end of 16th century its stance became almost unchallengeable. What was then the impact of these Naqshbandī activities upon the Katakīs and what was their response? To find out the answers to these questions, let us analyze the two extant biographies on the Katakī saints: TJK and TI.

According to TJK, Arshad al-Dīn had two sons: one named Fath al-Dīn remained in Kucha and Aqsu, and the other named Abū al-Naṣr sent to Turfan (See Table I). Abū al-Naṣr led the missionary works in Turfan, but later he was killed in the battle with the Chinese in Suzhou. TJK writes that because of this tragic death he gained the title of "Martyred Saint" (*Khwāja-i shahīd*).³⁹⁾ A 19th-century

Table I. The Genealogies of the Katakīs

TR	TI	TJK
Shujā' al-Dīn Maḥmūd	Shujā' al-Dīn	Ḥāfiẓ al-Dīn Kabīr
↑		
? generations		
↓	Jamāl al-Dīn	Jalāl al-Dīn
Jamāl al-Dīn	Arshīd al-Dīn	Rashīdīn

Arshad al-Dīn		□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
↑	Faṭḥ al-Dīn	Abū al-Faṭḥ Abū al-Naṣr
? generations		□ □
↓	Fakhr al-Dīn	Fakhr al-Dīn Abū al-Manṣūr
Ubayd Allāh Tāj al-Dīn		□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
	Tātlīq	Mirzā Khwāja 'Abd al-'Ahd Buzurg
	Malik(?)	
	Nizām al-Dīn	
	Fulāt Muḥammad	
	Muḥammad Ibrāhīm	
	Muḥammad Salīm	

Muslim traveler visited Bughur, west of Turfan, and found a mausoleum of a saint who had the epithet of Shahīd Khwāja. In the inscription there he discovered that the saint's name was Abū al-Naṣr.⁴⁰⁾ This confirms the record of TJK that Arshad al-Dīn sent one of his sons to Turfan in order to propagate Islam and to expand the religious influence of his family in the eastern frontier of the Moghul Khanate. TJK, however, does not elaborate on the fates of the descendants of Abū al-Naṣr, except that he had a son named Abū al-Manṣūr. In contrast with this, the author of TJK describes in detail Faṭḥ al-Dīn and his offsprings who settled in Kucha and Aqsu. The author apparently wrote this biography from the side of the western branch of the Katakīs.

In this sense, TI keeps the same perspective as TJK. It is not certain when TI was written, but a few clues allow us to assume that it was made at the end of 17th or in the first half of the 18th centuries.⁴¹⁾ It is quite strange that the author of TI, although citing TR,⁴²⁾ does not even mention the names of Tāj al-Dīn and Ahmad. They were the most eminent descendants of Arshad al-Dīn in Muḥammad Haydar's work.

As mentioned earlier, these two saints were Naqshbandīs and exercised a great influence in the Moghul court. Especially Tāj al-Dīn was *shaykh al-islām* in Turfan and led the army of Manṣūr Khan. Later he was killed in the battle with the Chinese.⁴³⁾ Ming sources frequently mention his name as "Huoze Tazhiding",⁴⁴⁾ Therefore, it is improbable that the author of TI did not know them, and we can not but conclude that he intentionally ignored them. Our assumption that TI was written by a person belonging to the Western branch of the Katakīs is further supported by the fact that he wrote the work by the recommendation of a certain Muḥammad Salīm Khwāja, the sixth generation from Faṭḥ al-Dīn.⁴⁵⁾

A few pieces of information allow us now to draw the following conclusion. In order to expand his religious influence all over Eastern Turkestan, Arshad al-Dīn sent Abū al-Naṣr to Turfan and left Faṭḥ al-Dīn in Kucha and Aqsu, but as time passed, the descendants of his two sons formed independent branches in the east and the west. The two biographies on the Katakī family, TJK and TI, were written in the circle of the western branch, and the attitudes of the authors suggest that the two branches were not in a friendly relation.

Let us now turn to the question of their responses to the increasing activities of the Naqshbandī sufis. It is very interesting to note that the two Katakī branches showed different responses to them. According to TR, Khwāja Tāj al-Dīn, after staying with Khwāja Aḥrār for some time in Samarqand, came back to Turfan with his recommendation and "inherited from his ancestors the office of Shaikh-ul-Islām of that country."⁴⁶⁾ As J.Fletcher suggested, "that country" here seems to indicate Turfan.⁴⁷⁾ This shows that he belonged to the eastern branch of the Katakīs and was probably one of the descendants of Abū al-Naṣr although the genealogies available at present are incomplete to prove this point. As for Khwāja Aḥmad we have no information showing his genealogy, but my guess is that he belonged to the eastern branch too. At any rate, through the example of Tāj al-Dīn, we can assume that members of the Turfan group, or at least a part of them, recognized the growing influence of the Naqshbandī path and chose to accept the new tide by way of converting themselves to Naqshbandīs.

Contrastingly, the western branch seems to have showed just the opposite response; not conversion but resistance. The two biographies of the Katakīs vindicate this point. TJK contains not a few stories which cannot be justified historically, but what we consider important there is not its factual aspect but the author's viewpoint. This work tries consistently to show how intimate the relations between the family of Arshad al-Dīn and the Moghul khanids were and how hard they worked for the welfare of the Kashgharian people. Therefore, the residents of Yarkand, according to TJK, declared to Aba Bakr, who the author incorrectly argues was sent by Khwāja Aḥrār:

This state is not the country of Khwāja Aḥrār but of Khwāja Fakhr al-Dīn [who is the son of Faṭḥ al-Dīn]. You rebelled against our Khwāja and opposed the *pādīshāh* of Islam. We do not need you and we have nothing to do with Khwāja Aḥrār.⁴⁸⁾

TI also insists that the inviolable rights were given to Arshad al-Dīn and his offsprings since the day of Tūghluq Timūr, thus it writes,

From the description above it was made clear that the status of Khwāja and the right for praying and supplication in Moghūliyya and the land of Kashghar, especially Aqsu, Kusan and Chaliṣh, were given as the inheritance to the descendants of the Master [that is, Arshad al-Dīn]. If somebody else was taking possession of the status of Khwāja, the positions of officials and prayers, and the properties of this country, it was so in

the manner of consignment. It is his duty to hand over the entrusted things to the [original] owner and to the descendants [of the Master].⁴⁹⁾

This quotation shows that the Katakīs already lost much of the secular as well as religious influence that they had once had, and they were claiming that what they had lost should be recovered.

Their resistance to the Naqshbandīs is also illustrated in a work written by Shāh Maḥmūd b. Churās who was a partisan of the Black Mountaineers. According to him, when Ishāq visited Kucha at the end of the 16th century, a certain Bāqī who was a descendant of Arshad al-Dīn and *qādī* of the city defied Ishāq, calling himself *makhdumzāda*, that is, "a sibling of the master".⁵⁰⁾ Shutur Khalfā who was sent to Turfan by Ishāq also met a strong opposition, but here the people who opposed him was not the Katakīs but the worshippers of Alp Ata.⁵¹⁾

Then on what ground did the Katakīs in Kucha and Aqsu defy the newcomers? They emphasized two points: first, they had vested rights in Eastern Turkestan inherited from their ancestors, and, second, they were the descendants of the Prophet Muḥammad. In other words, they insisted that there was no reason for them to yield to the Naqshbandīs not only in terms of secular rights but also in religious prestige. The first aspect does not need a further explanation since the preceding discussion shows enough on this point. The second aspect, however, needs some more elaborations.

On what basis did they claim the descendancy of the Prophet? In order to make such a claim they should have a genealogy as a proof, and it is what we see in TI. The genealogy traces the origin of the Katakī family up to 'Alī, Muḥammad's son-in-law. However, we should not forget that this holy lineage is not found in any of the earlier works, including TR, TBK, and TJK. Then, should we consider that the author of TI incidentally discovered a hitherto unknown genealogy? It is quite improbable. His genealogy seems to have been a "creation" rather than a "discovery".

In relation with the genealogy we find a curious phenomenon; the genealogy in TI and that of the Kashgharian khwājas are almost identical (see Table II). It is beyond a reasonable doubt that either of the two is a bogus. Which one should be blamed for plagiarism? In terms of chronology the Kashgharian khwājas' genealogy makes its first appearance in the biography of Makhdūm-i Aẓam written in 1610s,

Table II. Genealogies of Makhdūm-i Aẓam and Arshad al-Dīn

JM	HN	TAz	TI
Alī	Alī	Alī	Alī
Husayn	Husayn	Husayn	Husayn
Alī	Zayn al-'Abidīn	Zayn al-'Abidin	Zayn al-'Abidin
Muḥammad	Muḥammad Bāqir	Muḥammad Bāqir	Muḥammad Bāqir
Ja'far	Ja'far Ṣādiq	Ja'far Ṣādiq	Ja'far Ṣādiq
Mūsā al-Riḍā	Mūsā Kāẓim	Mūsā Kāẓim	Ja'far
Alī	Alī Mūsā	Alī Mūsā	Mūsā Kāẓim

↑	Ṭālib	Ṭālib	Alī Mūsā
□	ʿAbd Allāh ʿAraj	ʿAbd Allāh ʿAraj	Ṭālib
□	ʿAbd Allāh ʿAḏal	ʿAbd Allāh ʿAḏal	ʿAḏal
fifth generations	ʿUbayd Allāh	ʿUbayd Allāh	ʿAbd Allāh
□	Aḥmad	Aḥmad	Muḥammad
□	Muḥammad	Muḥammad	Ḥasan
□	Ḥasan	Ḥusayn	Ḥusayn
□	Ḥusayn	Ḥasan	Jalāl al-Dīn
□	Jalāl al-Dīn	Jalāl al-Dīn	Kamāl al-Dīn
	Kamāl al-Dīn	Kamāl al-Dīn	Burhān al-Dīn
	Burhān al-Dīn Qilich	Burhān al-Dīn Qilich	Mīr Dīvāna
Kamāl al-Dīn Majnūn	Mīr Dīvāna	Sayyid Khwāja	Muḥammad
Burhān al-Dīn Qilich	Mīr Khwāja	Burhān al-Dīn	Burhān al-Dīn
Burhān al-Dīn Khāl	Burhān al-Dīn	Jalāl al-Dīn	Shujāʿ al-Dīn
↑	Jalāl al-Dīn	Makhdūm-i Aẓam	Jamāl al-Dīn
third generations	Makhdūm-i Aẓam		Arshīd al-Dīn
□			
Jalāl al-Dīn Kasanī			
Makhdūm-i Aẓam			

Jamʿ al-maḳāmat (JM),⁵²⁾ which claims that he was a descendant of the Prophet Muḥammad. On the other hand, TI was written, as suggested earlier, much later than JM. It is possible that the genealogy in TI was the result of the reaction from the part of the western branch of the Katakīs to the encroachment of the Naqshbandīs who boasted their holy lineage.

Looking more carefully, however, into the several genealogies of these Kashgharian khwājas available to us, we find ourselves in a strange and confusing situation. The most typical genealogy can be found in *Ḥidāyat-nāma* (HN)⁵³⁾ accomplished in 1730–31 and in *Tadhkira-i ʿazīzān* (TAz)⁵⁴⁾ written in 1768–1769. But if we compare it with the one in JM which is the earliest, we can see the later genealogies are much more detailed and well arranged. In other words, unknown names in the early 17th century came to be known more than a century later and the blanks were filled with new names.

Mysteries do not end here. As a matter of fact, the earliest genealogy itself seems to contain some unreliable chains. In the genealogy of JM the names of Makhdūm-i Aẓam's grandfather and great-grandfather are not known, but his fifth ancestor was Burhān al-Dīn with the epithet of the “qīlich” meaning “sword”. He was known to be born between Kamāl al-Dīn and the daughter of Sulṭān Ilik Mādī.⁵⁵⁾ If it is true that he was the fifth ancestor of Makhdūm-i Aẓam who was born in 866/1461–62 and died in 949/1542–43, he should be a person of the early 14th century, that is, about a century, or at most one and a half century, earlier than Makhdūm-i Aẓam. However, Sulṭān Ilik Mādī, though it is difficult to identify him exactly, was without doubt

one of the Qarakhanid rulers: “*ilkh*” was one of the royal titles used by the Qarakhanids,⁵⁶⁾ and TR writes his name with Yūsuf Qādir Khan, another famous Qarakhan ruler.⁵⁷⁾ Thus, he must have been a person of four or five centuries earlier than Makhdūm-i Aẓam. This contradiction leads us to doubt the verity of the genealogy in JM. While being cautious not to make any hasty judgement, we should not forget the fact that Burhān al-Dīn Qilich was very famous charismatic figure, considered as a descendant of the Prophet, among the Central Asian Muslims.⁵⁸⁾ Anyhow, regardless of the question of whether Makhdūm-i Aẓam was actually Burhān al-Dīn Qilich's descendant or not, it is hard for us to give much credit to the 18th-century genealogy of Makhdūm-i Aẓam which was based and even expanded on the dubious one in JM.

Meanwhile, quite a different genealogy of Makhdūm-i Aẓam is seen in a historical work by Shāh Maḥmūd Churās – this work has no formal title, but, for the sake of convenience, I would call it *Tārīkh-i Churās* (TC).⁵⁹⁾ Akimushkin already noticed this difference. Raising a serious skepticism on the verity of the later genealogies, such as those in JM, HN, and TAz, he remarked that those “were apparently created by the command of the Khwājas in order to support their pretention on the supreme authority in government as well as ‘sacrosanctity’ of their origin.”⁶⁰⁾ While agreeing with his view, I would like to pursue the source of Shāh Maḥmūd's genealogy further.

As Table III shows, the genealogies in TC and TBK are almost identical. Since TC was written much later than TBK,⁶¹⁾ it is probable that the former was copied from the latter, or the two works may have been based on a same source unknown to us. But Shāh Maḥmūd considered Burhān al-Dīn Qilich the ancestor of the tenth generation of Makhdūm-i Aẓam. Apparently he did not see JM at this stage. Later, however, Shāh Maḥmūd revised this genealogy in his another hagiographic work, AT.⁶²⁾ Table III leaves no doubt that the revised genealogy was the combination of his old genealogy and the one in JM. Burhān al-Dīn became the fifth ancestor of Makhdūm-i Aẓam, and Ḥasan was grafted on Mūsa Kāẓim. Thus his revised genealogy became a sort of “hybrid”. However, this “hybrid” genealogy was not authenticated, though the reason is not clear, either by the “Black” or the “White” Mountaineers of the Kashgharian khwājas as shown by the Table II.

The forgery of genealogy was not a unique phenomenon in Eastern Turkestan. It is widely accepted that the Safavī rulers in Iran attempted to masquerade as the Shiites by eradicating all the evidences showing their connection with the Sunnis, and that they forged genealogy in order to appear themselves as the descendants of Muḥammad.⁶³⁾ After all, the forgery was needed to take the religious and the secular hegemony. In the case of Eastern Turkestan, too, the descendants of Makhdūm-i Aẓam and those of Arshad al-Dīn competed with each other, and as a result both sides seem to have forged genealogies to enhance their authorities.

Table III. Genealogies of Burhan al-Din Qilich and Makhdum-i A'zam

TBK	TC	AN
		All
		Ḥusayn
		All Zayn al-'Abidīn

		Muhammad Bâqir
		Ja'far Ṣâdiq
		Mûsâ Kâzîm
		All Mûsâ Ridâ
Husayn Madînf	Hasan Umadînf	Hasan
Tâhir	Tâhir	Tâhir
Hâshim		Qâsim
Qâshim	Qâsim	Burhân al-Dîn
Burhân al-Dîn	Burhân al-Dîn	Alâ al-Dîn
Alâ al-Dîn	Alâ al-Dîn	Qiyâ' al-Dîn
Qiyâ' al-Dîn	Qiyâ' al-Dîn	Ashraf al-Dîn
Ashraf al-Dîn	Ashraf al-Dîn	Jalâl al-Dîn
Jalâl al-Dîn	Jalâl al-Dîn	Kamâl al-Dîn Majnûn
		Burhân al-Dîn Qilich
Burhân al-Dîn Qilich	Burhân al-Dîn	↑
	↑	3rd generation
	□	□
	10th generation	□
	□	Jalâl Kasanf
	□	Makhdûm-i Aẓam
	Makhdûm-i Aẓam	

This is not all. They endeavoured to show their marriage relations with the families of khans as much as they emphasized the status of *sayyid*, i.e. the descendants of the Prophet. For example, Khwâja Ishâq is depicted as an offspring of Sâtuq Boghrâ Khan since his father Makhdûm-i Aẓam married Bîbîja-i Kâshgharî, the Khan's descendant.^[64] Khwâja Fakhr al-Dîn, a Katakî sufi, is recorded to have married Bîbî Aisha, another offspring of Sâtuq Boghrâ Khan.^[65] Later, descendants of Khwâja Âfâq were called *tûra*,^[66] in addition to the honorary title of *sayyid*, since he married a Chinggisid. All these tell us the intensity of the struggles waged between the Katakî sufis and the Kashgharian khwâjas.

3. The Uwaysîs

It was explained above how Khwâja Ahrâr attempted to expand the Naqshbandî influence in the Moghul Khanate by sending Muhammad Qâdî and Tâj al-Dîn. In the first half of the 16th century Naqshbandî activities became more conspicuous; eminent Naqshbandî saints, such as Khwâja Muhammad Yûsuf and Khwâja Khwând Nûrâ (alias Makhdûm-i Nûrâ), came to Eastern Turkestan.^[67] They were all Khwâja Ahrâr's grandsons and

quite well-known in Central Asia as the saints possessing miraculous power. They competed with each other in the Moghul court to obtain the favor of Saïd Khan, but the competition was ended by Khwând Nûrâ's victory with mysterious death of Yûsuf in 1530.⁶⁸⁾

However, the activities of the Naqshbandîs which were so intense as to cause competition among themselves suddenly received a serious blow during the reign of 'Abd al-Rashîd (r. 1533-1559/60), Saïd Khan's son. It was because he began to support Khwâja Muḥammad Sharîf who was not a Naqshbandî. In the reign of his successor 'Abd al-Karîm (r. 1559/60-1591/92), Muḥammad Sharîf and his disciples were still influential with the protection of the court.

Then, who was Muḥammad Sharîf? On his life there is only one biography in survival, *Tadhkira-i Khwâja Muḥammad Sharîf* (TMS).⁶⁹⁾ According to this work, he was born in Sairam (Western Turkestan) in the middle of the 15th century. His parents died when he was still a child, and he studied at Ulugh Beg Madrassa in Samarqand for thirty years. However, his stay there did not satisfy his religious thirst while the extreme poverty made his life more and more unbearable. Suddenly he saw in his dream the spirits of Sâtuq Boghrâ Khan and Aḥmad Yesevî; the former urged him to go to Kashghar while the latter recommended Turkistan. Following Sâtuq Boghrâ Khan's command, he went to Astin Artush, in the suburbs of Kashghar, where the Khan's mausoleum was located. He stayed there for a while and departed later for a pilgrimage to Mecca by way of India. After having returned to Kashghar, he kept on studying and teaching. Then an incident took place which tied together Muḥammad Sharîf and 'Abd al-Rashîd Khan.

The incident was the death of 'Abd al-Laṭîf, the Khan's eldest son in Aqsu taking charge of controlling the nomadic Kazakhs and Kirghiz in the north of the T'ien-shan ranges. In 1566 a Kazakh chief, Haqq Naẓar Khan, attacked Aqsu with other Kazakh and Kirghiz chiefs and killed 'Abd al-Laṭîf. 'Abd al-Rashîd Khan resolved to avenge his son's death and visited Muḥammad Sharîf at Astin Artush to request a blessing for the success of the expedition. They visited the mausoleum of Yûsuf Qâdir Khan together and asked the saint what to do. Spirits of a number of saints — Khwâja Khidr, Uways al-Qaranî, Sâtuq Boghrâ Khan, and others — appeared suddenly and gave them a permission for the expedition. Then the Khwâja went to Yarkand, the Moghul capital, to pray, and the Khan launched the northern expedition. After three months of fighting, he gained a great victory, executing many nomadic chiefs beginning with Haqq Naẓar Khan.⁷⁰⁾

We can easily imagine that the relations of the two became intimate after this incident. However, sources do not reveal what the activities of Khwâja Muḥammad Sharîf were from this incident to his death in 1555-56 at the age of 95 and what went on between the Khan and the Khwâja. Although we cannot say for certain how far his influence reached, from the facts that he settled in the Kashghar area after he came to Eastern Turkestan and that he resided in Yarkand since the expedition of 'Abd al-Rashîd we can conclude that his activity was largely centered in the western part of the Tarim Basin. His tomb is also in Yarkand.⁷¹⁾

We have seen above the life of Khwâja Muḥammad Sharîf. Now the question is why 'Abd al-Rashîd Khan asked the help of this 'rustic' sufi instead of well-known Naqshbandî saints. 'Abd al-Rashîd was not like Tûghluq Timûr who had spent most of his life in the steppe. He was well versed both in Persian and Turki and

received education enough to write poems. He was also very good in playing musical instruments.⁷²⁾ In spite of this background he chose Muḥammad Sharīf. In order to understand what he had in mind we should first examine the political situation of 'Abd al-Rashīd Khan.

When he was enthroned, he was faced with internal as well as external threats. At the news of his father Saīd Khan's death, who was on returning from Tibetan expedition, he came to Yarkand from Aqsu and was enthroned to khan. However, he had to confront strong oppositions. First of all, his uncle Maṣṣūr Khan in Turfan marched with his army to expand his dominion, so he had to wage a severe battle. He won the battle, but Maṣṣūr contested his power again and again.⁷³⁾ Besides, his relation with tribal chiefs in the Moghul Khanate was also complicated; especially the Dughlat chiefs with whom he seemed to maintain a cordial relation were, in fact, limiting a free exercise of his monarchical power. He needed to be freed from their pressure. In addition to these internal threats to his power, he had to deal with the Kazakhs who immigrated to Moghulistan *en masse* and the Kirghiz who moved from the valley of the Yenissei river to the northern slopes of the T'ien-shan ranges. The Oirats were expanding their sphere of influence too. Because of the pressure from these nomadic peoples, the Moghuls had been forced to migrate to the south of the T'ien-shan into the Tarim Basin. Nonetheless their raids and incursions did not cease.⁷⁴⁾

In order to overcome, at first, the internal threat 'Abd al-Rashīd Khan executed a Dughlat chief named Sayyid Muḥammad Mīrzā. Shocked by "the shedding of innocent blood, and by an absence of humanity", Muḥammad Ḥaydar, the author of TR and the nephew of Sayyid Muḥammad, fled to India.⁷⁵⁾ Having crushed the power of the Dughlats in this way, 'Abd al-Rashīd Khan allied himself with the Barlas which was a relatively weak nomadic group and had been despised as its epithet, "ass" (*himar*), suggests.⁷⁶⁾ However, those tribal chiefs who were uncomfortable with his policy of centralization went to Khotan to oppose him. The rebellion was suppressed by force, and the chiefs were exiled abroad.⁷⁷⁾ After consolidating his stand within the khanate by suppressing the opposition of the tribal chiefs, he launched an expedition against the nomads in Moghulistan. Thus he succeeded in eliminating both internal and external threats.

The Naqshbandī saints maintained a solid ground from the time of Yūnus and drew many supporters from nomadic elites. Therefore, the Naqshbandī path itself, with a large number of followers in the nomadic tribes that the Khan was trying to suppress, could be a threat. The situation was same with the Yesevī path which had not a few followers in the Moghul court. Sayyid Muḥammad of the Dughlats was the case. Compared with these sufi organizations, Muḥammad Sharīf was much safer for the Khan. Moreover, he, as the guardian of Sātuq Boghrā Khan's mausoleum, symbolized the harmony of secular and religious authorities and drew popular supports from the residents of Kashgharia. These were exactly what 'Abd al-Rashīd Khan needed, which, I think, prompted him to ally with Muḥammad Sharīf.

Although the political situation of 'Abd al-Rashīd Khan facilitated this alliance whose initiate he took, we should not underestimate the tenacity of the root the local sufis had laid in Eastern Turkestan society. Muḥammad Sharīf did not remain as an individual sufi; he appears to have initiated the so-called "Uwaysī movement",⁷⁸⁾ Al-Wasīf suggested in the early 14th century that there had been the Uwaysīyya but it was

already extinct in his times.⁷⁹⁾ Therefore, Muḥammad Sharīf was not the creator of the Uwaysī tariqa but simply the reorganizer of the extinct line. In this relation, TBK is an interesting piece of work. As Baldick made it clear, this is the collected biographies of Uwaysī saints, some imaginary and legendary and others historical. The question is why the author who apparently belonged to this circle, took pains to write this kind of work. I think this was a peculiar way of response to the increasing pressure from the Naqshbandiyya. Who the real author was – Aḥmad Uzgenī or Muḥammad Sharīf – does not make any difference in this matter. In order to cope with this well-organized and already firmly established path like the Naqshbandiyya, he had to elevate the religious authority of his own group. To achieve this goal he included some legendary saints among the Central Asian Muslims, such as Jamāl al-Dīn Katakī and Burhan al-Dīn Qilich, among the category of the Uwaysiyya. He wanted to show that “the Uwaysī path” or “the congregation of the Uwaysiyya”⁸⁰⁾ had a long and venerable tradition comparable with other famous paths.

The Kashgharian Uwaysī movement initiated and led by Muḥammad Sharīf exercised great influence in secular as well as religious realms during the period of ‘Abd al-Rashīd Khan and ‘Abd al-Karīm Khan. Muḥammad Walī Ṣūfī who was designated as the successor to Muḥammad Sharīf stood for ‘Abd al-Karīm in his struggle for the throne against Ibrāhīm, another son of ‘Abd al-Rashīd. Obviously ‘Abd al-Karīm was victorious, and we can easily imagine that the followers of Muḥammad Sharīf became much more influential in ‘Abd al-Karīm's court. According to a contemporary source, Khwāja ‘Ubayd Allāh who was “minister” (*vazīr*) of ‘Abd al-Karīm was also Muḥammad Sharīf's disciple.⁸¹⁾ It is no surprise that Khwāja Ishāq Walī who visited Kashgharia received a cold reception from ‘Abd al-Karīm.

Muḥammad Khan who had maintained an uneasy relationship with his brother, ‘Abd al-Karīm, and eventually succeeded the throne, however, was a fervent follower of Ishāq, so with his succession the ground for the Kashgharian Uwaysiyya was rapidly eroded. From the 17th century began the monopoly of the Naqshbandiyya, and henceforth the struggle was no more between the Naqshbandīs and the local sufis like the Katakīs or the Uwaysīs than among the Naqshbandīs themselves.

4. Muslim Saints and Eastern Turkestan Society

We have examined above the relations between the early Muslim sufis and the Moghul rulers. We should not neglect, at the same time, the role those sufis performed in the sedentary society of Eastern Turkestan. As is well known, Central Asian oases were severely damaged by the invasion of the Mongols led by Chinggis Khan at the beginning of the 13th century. Even Bartol'd who warned against the exaggeration of the destruction done by the Mongols acknowledged that in the 1250s pastures were expanded at the expense of urban centers and in the 14th century many cities near Ili, Chu, and Talas rivers were destroyed so completely that it was impossible to find them on the maps. The deterioration of the urban life continued even after the initial plundering attacks.⁸²⁾ The basic reason was the weakness of the monarchical power which

resulted in the perennial succession struggles and the frequent clashes among tribes. After all, in the first half of the 14th century the sedentarization policy pursued by Kebek Khan and Tarmashirin Khan raised strong opposition from nomadic tribes. Tarmashirin was deposed and the Chaghatay Khanate itself was split into two parts. These disruptive political situations gave serious effects to the cities in the Semirechye and the Syr Daryan areas.⁸³⁾

Western Turkestan was restored during the reign of Timūr as the splendor of Samarqand evidences. But the Moghul Khanate, the eastern realm of the Chaghatay Khanate held by more conservative nomadic Moghuls, was not the case. A series of expeditions launched by Timūr delivered catastrophic blows not only to the ruling stratum of the khanate but also to the sedentary centers in Eastern Turkestan. Chen Cheng who passed through this area as an envoy of the Yonglo Emperor to a Timurid ruler Shahrukh witnessed the miserable condition of Yangi (= Taraz): "For a long time smoke has vanished in the demolished towns and quarters... People cannot find security and cannot live in peace because of fightings."⁸⁴⁾

Moreover, the warfare between nomadic groups in the Moghul Khanate waged at the cost of the welfare of sedentary population was also destructive. For example, in order to take the city of Kashghar which was being under the control of Ulugh Beg, Esen Buqa Khan employed the tactics of attacking the city in every autumn to destroy the harvest in the suburbs. The residents of Kashghar had no choice but surrender: "We have lost the crops of two successive years; if we lose this year's crop too, there will be a famine in our country."⁸⁵⁾ It is hard to deny that this kind of nomadic warfare decreased the agricultural area. The life of the peasants was not easy.

In these circumstances the Muslim saints seem to have contributed to the rehabilitation of sedentary life in Eastern Turkestan. Because of the lack of information we can not tell the details of their activities or the results, but it is not difficult to assume that the contribution of the sufis who were influential in the court and had a strong bond with the ruling stratum was considerable. Especially, their activities seem to have been centered on the construction of villages and the repair of the irrigation system. There is no need to reiterate the importance of the irrigation in Central Asian society. Not only wars but also negligence in repair could easily give an irreparable damage to the irrigation system. TR writes how Uways Khan "dug a deep well" and drew "water for irrigation." Despite his effort, he "never attained the value of an ass's load; but this served him for a yearly supply of food."⁸⁶⁾ The fact that Muḥammad Ḥaydar recorded this episode with special emphasis tells us how exceptional it was for a nomadic ruler to pay attention to irrigation and agriculture.

One of the most conspicuous cases of the rural rehabilitation by the Katakī sufis was the construction of the city of Aqsu. TJK claims that Yarkand and Aqsu were constructed by them. According to it, the place where the present Aqsu is located was then called Ardabil, and with no resident the village was buried in the sands. One day the spirit of Arshad al-Dīn appeared to Abū al-Faṭḥ whom he ordered to go to Ardabil and build a city there. Abū al-Faṭḥ went to Ardabil with five hundred people and constructed a fort which was called Aqsu from that time on.⁸⁷⁾ In addition, a certain Naẓar Mīrzâ of the Dughlats built a fort by the Tumshuq cliff near the Zarafshan river under the sponsorship of the Katakī saints. Thus it came to be called 'the city of

cliff'(*yâr + kenî*). Within five years the population increased to ten thousand households, and the city became the capital of the Moghul Khanate.⁸⁸⁾

We do not have to believe all these stories in TJK. As pointed out earlier, its descriptions contradict with historical facts in many parts since the prime purpose of this hagiography was to emphasize the prerogatives of the Katakîs. The argument that Yarkand and Aqsu were built by the Katakî saints may reflect this viewpoint; that is, the Naqshbandî activities in these cities were trespassing other's territory. As a matter of fact, the name 'Yarkand' can be identified as early as from the period of the Mongol Empire, therefore the contention of TJK should be rejected.⁸⁹⁾

But, Aqsu was not the case. The name 'Aqsu' first appears in the Timurid sources around the end of the 14th century.⁹⁰⁾ It is not found in the records of Chen Cheng who traveled near this city. It seems that the name Aqsu came into being only around the end of the 14th century and before that time it was called Ardabil.⁹¹⁾ If we remember that Ay Kôl where Arshad al-Dîn met Tûghluq Timûr at first was close to the present Aqsu and that the Katakî saints were quite influential in its environs, it is probable that they played an active role in the construction of Aqsu on the desolate village of Ardabil at the end of the 14th century. Their participation in it was recorded in TJK and TI as well as in another source written at the end of the 19th century in Kucha.⁹²⁾

The biography of Muḥammad Sharîf shows a similar theme on the recovery of village life. For example, he "turned, with a miraculous act, several villages fertile by drawing water from near Mashhad",⁹³⁾ or, having felt sympathy with the remonstrance of the people who were complaining about the scarcity of the water supply, stroke the land with his rod and drew a stream of water, with which several villages became abundant.⁹⁴⁾ These stories, of course, were taken by the author to show the magical power of Muḥammad Sharîf, but we need to reflect upon the historical meaning behind them.

It is not clear how active role the religious figures had performed in the irrigation of Eastern Turkestan. Although there are scattered evidence proving their involvement in the irrigation matters,⁹⁵⁾ it remains for further research. Nonetheless, I think the above analysis, though not sufficient, demonstrated the fact that sufis had actually participated in such works during the 14th-16th centuries. In this sense, they performed a very important social function in the Moghul Khanate. The Khanate consisted of two different sub-societies, the ruling nomads and the ruled sedentaries. They were antagonistic not only in political and economic but also in cultural terms. The nuance of 'Tajik' applied to non-nomadic Eastern Turkestan residents during the time of Tûghluq Timûr reflects the pride of the nomads in their own way of life and their despise of the settled peasants.⁹⁶⁾ However, the conversion of the Moghul nomads prepared a common cultural ground with the sedentaries, both of which together formed the same Islamic "community" (*ummah*). In this respect, the early Muslim saints served as a nexus joining the two antagonistic parts of the society and providing a cultural identity to the people within the Moghul Khanate. Moreover, they contributed to the spread of the Islamic culture in Eastern Turkestan and eventually prepared a road for the introduction of better organized sufi path, such as the Naqshbandîyya, although they fiercely fought against it.

Conclusion

The activities of the early Muslim saints and their responses to the inroads of the Naqshbandīs can be summarized as follows. First of all, it has not been clear to which sufi path the two famous Muslim sufis, Jamāl al-Dīn Katakī and Arshad al-Dīn who converted Tūghluq Timūr, belonged, but the above analysis shows that they actually did not belong to any known path but simply wandering individual dervishes. Because they were not restrained from any mystic organization, they could take a flexible attitude in persuading the nomads like Tūghluq Timūr and his tribal chiefs. The nomads did not have to understand complicated doctrines of Islam and could be accepted as Muslims without fastidious procedures, while the sufis achieved their goal of converting 'infidels'. At the same time, Tūghluq Timūr who had to overcome the centrifugal tendency of the nomadic tribes and to consolidate the monarchical power found in Islam an ideological prop for his policy. In this sense, Islam provided him with an ideology of supra-tribal unity and centralization. His western expedition may not have been possible without the ideological support of Islam.

From the 15th century the activities of the Naqshbandīs in Eastern Turkestan gradually increased. The descendants of Arshad al-Dīn, by that time already organized as a kind of local sufi group which we call now the Katakīs, began to feel its pressure. They responded to it in a peculiar way. The two branches of the Katakīs, one in Turfan and the other in Aqsu and Kucha, chose different attitudes: the former compromised with the new force and became the Naqshbandīs themselves, while the latter decided to resist it. The resistance was expressed in their demand for the vested rights in Eastern Turkestan and in the creation of a new genealogy proving that they were the descendants of the Prophet Muḥammad. Curiously enough, their genealogy is almost identical with that of the Kashgharian khwājas, i.e. Makhdūm-i Aẓam's descendants. Although we can not say definitely, it seems that the Katakī genealogy seems to have been copied from the latter. Nonetheless, the genealogy of the Kashgharian khwājas also contains highly suspicious names which were probably inserted later in order to enhance their religious charisma. The one we know at present was completed only in the 18th century. At any rate, this kind of forgeries and falsifications illustrates how intense the struggle was between the Katakīs and the Naqshbandīs.

The influence of the local sufis like the Katakīs gradually decreased, but it did not disappear completely, as evidenced by the revival of their power in the later half of the 16th century. 'Abd al-Rashīd Khan, Moghul ruler at that time, suddenly took hands with Muḥammad Sharīf who did not belong to the Naqshbandiyya. He was just a guardian of Sātuq Boghrā Khan's mausoleum. The Khan's measure was in line with his policy to eliminate internal and external threats and to strengthen his power. The influence of Muḥammad Sharīf and his followers in the courts of 'Abd al-Rashīd Khan and 'Abd al-Karīm Khan increased rapidly, and he initiated the Kashgharian Uwaysī movement in order to compete with the Naqshbandiyya. TBK, a collection of biographies of the so-called Uwaysī sufis was written in this circle for that purpose. However, with the death

of 'Abd al-Kārim Khan, his followers lost their foothold in the court of a new ruler, Muḥammad Khan, who was a staunch ally of Khwāja Ishāq Wālī. And with this began the period of monopoly by the Kashgharian khwājas.

These early Muslim saints performed active roles in reconstructing towns and villages and in repairing the irrigation system which had been destroyed under the rule of nomads. The best example is the (re)construction of Aqsu at the end of the 14th century to which the Katakīs seems to have made an important contribution. In addition to the rehabilitation of the oasis life, the early Muslim saints contributed to expanding and deepening Islamic culture in Eastern Turkestan so that the nomads and the peasants, Muslim saints functioning as a nexus, ultimately came to form one Muslim community.

From the 17th century onward the Naqshbandīs not only took complete control over the religious life in Eastern Turkestan but also began to be involved in the politics, and finally the period of the so-called 'Heiligenstaat' was ensued. The struggle was no longer between them and the upholders of local sufi paths but among themselves, and it continued to the end of the 19th century. Apart from these religious nobility, another ruling stratum emerged, based on the possession of land and offices. They were called *beg*. These two strata, the khwājas and the begs, formed together the ruling class in Eastern Turkestan society.

As those local sufis lost their ground, they were no more mentioned in historical sources. Some of their descendants, however, continued to guard their ancestors' mausoleums exerting religious influence in limited localities and others transformed themselves into members of the beg class. Since the 18th century begs began to show the conflict of interests with the Kashgharian khwājas, and many of them allied with the Manchus in their conquest of the region. Muḥammad Amīn Khwāja who was one of the most representative figures among the begs who sided with the Manchus was a descendant of Muḥammad Sharīf.⁹⁷⁾ Moreover, Rāshidīn Khwāja and Mu'azzam, the leaders in Kucha and Ili during the 1864 Muslim rebellion, were also the descendants of Arshad al-Dīn and Muḥammad Sharīf.⁹⁸⁾ These are ample evidences that illustrates how persistent the influence of the early Muslim saints were in Eastern Turkestan society.