

Bābil for example, and to resist the Muslim advance became no more than a few battles which in no way altered the situation. Finally Sa'd marched on al-Madā'in and, after having besieged and conquered Bahudasir, one of the seven or ten towns which made up the al-Madā'in ("the towns") group, was even able to ford the Tigris; this remarkable occurrence was regarded as the result of divine favour. After reaching the east bank of the river the Muslims occupied the other towns of al-Madā'in, which had been abandoned without a struggle by Yazdadjird (Dhu 'l-Hijjaj 15 or 16?). Another battle of some importance took place on 'Irāqī soil, at Djalūla' (on Šafar 16 or 17?; other dates are also mentioned in the sources), marking the definitive overthrow of Sasanid dominion in 'Irāq by the Muslims.

Problems associated with the battle. There are two such problems which, in all probability, must remain insoluble: 1) The total strength of the forces which met at al-Kādisiyya, for there is too great a difference between the figures given in the sources and every attempt to arrive at an evaluation comes up against the impossibility of finding any solid foundation to build on; 2) the chronology of the events preceding the battle and following it and thus of the battle itself—dates given in the sources for the battle vary between the years 14 and 16, but the earlier date must be rejected since there is too much circumstantial evidence against it. Islamists working on the chronological problem, such as Wellhausen, Caetani and S. M. Yusuf, have looked for an answer by reasoning from the facts, and since it has proved impossible to reconcile the data given in the sources have chosen those which shored up their own beliefs. They consider it impossible that the Muslims could have recovered their strength almost immediately after the defeat at the Bridge and have dated the battle of al-Buwayb in 14 (according to Caetani no earlier than Ramaḡān), which obliges them to date the battle of al-Kādisiyya at the beginning of 16 (Wellhausen adds further considerations of the supervening events of the period which occurred between this battle and the battle of Djalūla'). In addition, Caetani and S. M. Yusuf consider the relationship between the campaign in Syria and that in 'Irāq and decide that the caliph 'Umar could not have concerned himself with the second until after the end of the first, that is after the battle of Yarmūk: as this celebrated victory of the Muslims over the Byzantines took place on 12 Radjab 15/20 August 636, the battle of al-Kādisiyya could not have been fought before the early months of the year 16. S. M. Yusuf places it a little after Radjab 15, i.e. a month after Yarmūk.

After a fresh examination of the facts as they developed and as they are set down in chronological accounts in the sources, the author of the present article has concluded that Muḡarram 15/February-March 636 is the date to be preferred for the battle of al-Kādisiyya. The Muslim success at al-Buwayb soon after their defeat at the Bridge is not to be considered impossible for the following reasons: 1) the troubles which broke out at al-Madā'in stopped the Persians from capitalizing on their victory at the Bridge; 2) Muslim reinforcements from Medina arrived immediately. Nor is it necessary to suppose that 'Umar could not have been concerned with the 'Irāqī campaign until after the battle of Yarmūk, for such a view makes it extremely difficult to determine the date when the caliph resolved to send a fighting army into 'Irāq; in fact, 1) if 'Umar did not

take his decision until after Yarmūk, there is not a sufficient interval of time between the great battles of Yarmūk and al-Kādisiyya for Sa'd's march, with the halts he made and his waiting period for the enemy (which the sources describe with too great detail for them to be ignored); it was perhaps this difficulty which led Caetani to propose that the battle did not take place in Muḡarram 16 but some months later; 2) if, to allow the necessary time for Sa'd's march and his waiting for the enemy, the caliph were presumed to have taken his decision in 15 during the month preceding the battle of Yarmūk, then 'Umar would have directed his forces towards 'Irāq precisely at the moment when he must have been greatly preoccupied by the news of the Byzantine emperor's preparations for the offensive. On the contrary, if we concede that Sayf has given an exact account of the assemblage of the army at Širār during Muḡarram 14 and of Sa'd's long march, then it follows that 'Umar decided at the end of the year 13 to renew with vigour the campaign in 'Irāq, that is during the period when his victories in Syria were following one after the other. These considerations, which are also supported by other circumstances—which the author of this article intends to set forth in another work—lead us to decide on the date of Muḡarram 15/February-March 636 for the battle of al-Kādisiyya.

Bibliography: Arabic sources: Tabarī, i, 2202, 2347, 2349-59 (after Ibn Ishāk), 2377 (after Wākidi), 2336-8 (after 'Awāna), 2211-9, 2221-35, 2244-85, 2285-2341, 2344-6, 2361-7, 2341-3, 2419-55, 2456-67, 2470, 2474-9 (after Sayf b. 'Umar) and index; Tabarī-Zotenberger, iii, 385-400 (with a few details absent from other sources but in general following Sayf's account); Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb, *Kitāb al-Kharāḡi*, Būlāḡ 1302, 16-7 (tr. Fagnan, 45-7, 48-9); Ibn Sa'd (for the chronology), iii/1, 30 and index (ix/2, 31 s.v. al-Kādisiyya); Balādhuri, *Futūḡ*, 254-65; Dīnawari, 125-36; Ya'qūbi, ii, 163-5, 173; Mas'ūdi, *Murādī*, iv, 201-4, 207-25 = ed. & tr. Pellat §§ 1532-4, 1538-57; *Aghāni* (the episode of the poet Abū Miḡdjan), xxi, 212-7 and index; Ḥamza al-Isfahāni, *Ta'riḡh sinī mulūk al-ard wa'l-abiya'*, ed. Gottwaldt, Leipzig 1844, 151-3; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Istī'āb* (episode) 745, no. 3191 (for other sources of the same episode, see Caetani, 16 A. H., §§ 102, 107); Yāqūt, *Mu'djam*, iv, 7 f., i, 769, iv, 323, ii, 107, and index; Ibn al-Athīr, ii, 344-52, 354-77, 393-410; Ibn al-Djawzi, *Muntaḡam*, Ms. Aya Sofia, fols. 14r-20v (beginning of the year 15) fols. 28v-31v (beginning of the year 16); Ibn Khaldūn, *Muḡaddima*, ed. Quatremère, i, 15, 230, 285, ii, 692, iii, 135 (tr. Rosenthal, i, 17, 259, 320-1, ii, 77-8, iii, 168-9); idem, *'Ibar*, ed. Beirut¹ 1966-8, i, 14, 220 f., 278, 483, ii, 325, 561, 637, 657, 915-9, 921-3, 935-42 and index of the first three volumes (Ibn Khaldūn's account of the battle is a resumé of traditions collected by Sayf, as are the brief accounts of Miskawayh, Abū 'l-Fidā', Nuwayrī, Dḡhabī and Ibn al-Furāt, and the longer ones in *al-Fakhri*, ed. Ahlwardt, 106-14, and Ibn Zayni Daḡlān, *al-Futūḡat al-Islāmiyya*, Mecca 1311, i, 54-69.—Citations of warriors who fell in the battle given in *Istī'āb*, *Usd*, *Iṣāba*, *Tadrijid* of Dḡhabī can be found in L. Caetani, *Annali dell'Islām*, 16 A.H., § 118, note 1.

Greek, Syriac and Armenian sources: summarized in Caetani, 16 A.H., §§ 113-7, 172, 173; see also F. Baethgen, *Fragmente syrischer und arabischer Historiker*, Leipzig 1884. (Abhandl.

für die Kunde des Morgenlandes DMG, viii, 3), text 16, tr. 110.

Persian sources: Mirkḡwānd, *Rawḡat al-safā'*, lithograph Bombay 1825, ii, 270-8; Khwandamir, *Habib al-siyar*, lithograph Bombay 1857, 14, 20-3.

Western authors: G. Weil, *Geschichte der Chalifen*, i, 65-73, 83; A. Müller, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland*, i (1885), 235-43; J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi, Berlin 1899, 68-83; L. Caetani, *Annali dell'Islām*: (the events) iii, 14 A.H. §§ 5, 9-11, 19, 23-5, 45-63, 66, 16 A.H., §§ 3-35, 39-118, 134-228; (critique of the sources and critical resumé of the events): 13 A.H., §§ 1-3, 14 A.H. §§ 1-3, 16 A.H., §§ 1-2, 119-33, 229-37; C. H. Becker, *Islamstudien*, i, 88 f.; S. M. Yusuf, *The battle of al-Qadisiyya*, in IC, xix (1945), i-18.

(L. VECCHIA VAGLERII)

iii. In addition to the two towns mentioned above, Yāqūt knows three other places called al-Kādisiyya, namely two villages in the district of al-Mawšil in the Nahr al-Kḡāzir between al-Mawšil and Irbid, and a third near Dījazirat b. 'Umar; see Yāqūt, *al-Muḡhtarik* ed. Wüstenfeld, 337. Ibn al-Athīr also mentions an al-Kādisiyya near Baḡhdād (xii, 91). For the possible relationship of these places and others similarly named to a people (Kādisaeans) that may have settled them, see Nöldeke, *ZDMG*, xxxiii, 157 f., 162; J. Marquart, *Erānsahr nach der Geographie des Pseudo-Moses Xorenaq'i* (Abhandlungen der Gött. Ges. der Wiss., 1901), 77, 78. (M. STRECK-[J. LASSNER])

ΚΑΔΙΔΑΡ, Turcoman tribe, from which sprang a ruling dynasty of Persia (see next article). There is no foundation for the statements of later historians that the Kādīār tribe entered Iran with Hūlagū [q.v.]. In the 9th/15th century they formed part of the Boz Ok branch of the Turcomans of Anatolia, dwelling in the Kayseri-Sivas region and recognizing the suzerainty of the Dhu 'l-Kādr rulers. They probably take their name from a leader named Karāḡar (= Karḡar). In the 9th/15th century they were divided into four sub-tribes (*oba*): Aḡḡa Koyunlu, Aḡḡalu, Šām Bayātī, Yīva. The first two of these were branches of the great tribes belonging to the *ulus* of the Dulkadirīl. The third was a branch of the Bayāts of northern Syria (it is very probable that the Dulkadirīl dynasty sprang from the Bayāts); Šām Bayātī owes its name to the fact that it wintered in Syria, but we do not know to which of these subtribes the Kādīār dynasty belonged. After the Kādīārs had entered Iran and settled in northern Āḡharbāyḡdīān (Arrān) they were joined by an important clan called Igirmi (= Yirmi) Dört.

The defeat of the Kara Koyunlu by the Ak-Koyunlu, who thenceforth ruled much of Iran, prompted important branches of the Turcoman tribes of Anatolia to move into Persia: thus towards the end of the 9th/15th century the Kādīār settled in the Karabāḡh (Gandjā) district of northern Āḡharbāyḡdīān. In 897/1491-2 a member of the ruling house of the Ak-Koyunlu, named Dana Khalil-oḡlu Ibrāhīm Beg and known as Ayba (or İba) Sultān, with the support of the Kādīār raised to the throne Uzun Ḥasan's grandson Rustam Beg. When Rustam Beg was defeated by Aḡmad b. Uḡurlu Muḡammad b. Uzun Ḥasan Beg he took refuge with the Kādīār in 1497. Although the Kādīār supported Rustam, the latter was defeated again and killed. Soon afterwards a part of the Kādīār rallied to Šāh Ismā'īl and, like so many other Anatolian Turcoman tribes, contributed to the establishment of the Šafawid

dynasty. For the next two centuries, however, they were not held in such esteem by the shahs as were, e.g., the Ustadjālu (Ustadjlu), Tekelū, Šāmlu and Dḡlkadr (Dulkadir). At this period the Kādīār were again dwelling in north Āḡharbāyḡdīān. At the end of the 10th/16th century Imām Kulī Khān, who was *beglerbegi* of Karabāḡh, was a member of the Yīva *oba* of the Kādīār. But during Šafawid times the Kādīār were administered mostly by the Ziyād Oḡlu family from which sprang the future ruling Kādīār dynasty. At the time of Šāh 'Abbās some of the Kādīār were transferred to the district of Astarābād, to be a barrier against the raids of the Yaka Turcomans.

In the 12th/18th century, whereas some tribes—Šāmlu, Dulkadir, etc.—broke up and lost their power, the Avšhar (Afšhar) and Kādīār remained numerous and strong. Hence under Nādir Šāh the Afšhar were able to put an end to the Šafawid dynasty and seize power, and at the end of the century the Kādīār could succeed the Zand. In the 18th century the Astarābād Kādīār were divided into two branches: the Ašḡāka Bāšh and the Yūkhārī Bāšh. The Ašḡāka Bāšh were formed by the Koyunlu (or Kowānlū), 'Izz al-dīnlū, Šām Bayātī, Karā Mūsānlū (Mūsālu?), Wāšhlū (Ašhlū?) and Ziyādū subtribes. The Kādīār dynasty belonged to the Koyunlu (or Kowānlū) subtribe of the Ašḡāka Bāšh. As for the Yūkhārī Bāšh, they were formed by the other six subtribes, i.e., Dawālū, Šāpānlū, Kōhnālū, Khazīnadarū, Kayāklū, and Kerlū(?). The chief subtribe of this branch was the Dawālū.

The Kādīār rulers never forgot that they were Turks. They were even proud of it. Thus, some members of the Kādīār dynasty bore the names of Ilkhānid and even Ottoman rulers, e.g., Hūlagū, Abaka, Aḡḡun, Ildirim Bayāzid etc. We see also some Kādīār clans (*oymak*) in Anatolia in the Ottoman period, between the 16th and 20th centuries.

Bibliography: F. Sümer, *Oḡuzlar*, Ankara 1967, 152, 154, 155, 228, 234, 286, 287, 358, 366; idem, *Safevi devletinin kuruluş ve gelişmesinde Anadolu Türklerinin rolü* (in press). (F. SÜMER)

ΚΑΔΙΔΑΡ (*kaçar* "marching quickly"), cf. Sulaymān Efendī, *Lughat-i Čaḡḡatai*, Istanbul 1298, 214; P. Pelliot, *Notes sur l'histoire de la horde d'or*, Paris 1950, 203-4), a Turcoman tribe, to which the Kādīār dynasty of Persia belonged; also a village in the Litkūh district of Āmul [q.v.]. Nineteenth century Persian historians assert that the Kādīār took their name from Kādīār Noyān b. Sirtāk Noyān. The latter was the son of Sābā Noyān b. Djalārīr, and was appointed *atabeg* [q.v.] to Arḡḡūn (Riḡā Kulī Khān Hidayat, *Ta'riḡh-i rawḡat al-safā'-yi nāsvī*, Tehran 1961-2, ix, 4). It is also alleged that the Kādīār migrated from the Muḡḡān steppe to Syria towards the middle of the 8th/14th century and that they came back to Persia with Timūr. This may well be so, but there does not appear to be any mention of a tribe by the name of Kādīār in Mongol or Timurid times. What may be the earliest mention of them is in 897/1491-2 when the *laskhar-i kādjār* is said to have joined Dānā Khalil b. Ibrāhīm of the Ak Koyunlu to free Rustam Beg b. Maḡsūd from the fortress of Alindjak, where he had been held captive by rival khāns (Yaḡyā Kazvīnī, *Lubb al-tawāriḡh*, 1936-7, 225-6, quoted by F. Sümer, *Oḡuzlar*, Ankara 1967, and Ibn Karbalā'ī, *Rawḡat al-djinnān wa-djinnat al-djinnān*, ed. Dīā'far Sultān al-Karā'ī, Tehran 1946-7, 526), but it should be pointed out that Kādīār may here be simply the name of a person.

Karā Piri Beg Kādīār is mentioned as being among

R125 The political economy of Iran under the Qajars:
society, politics and foreign relations, 1796 to 1926 /
Amirahmadi, Hooshang. London, 2012 (International
Library of Iranian Studies, 30). *Kaçarlar*
Matthee, Rudi. *Middle East Journal*, 67 ii (2013),
pp.333-335 (E) 111340

27 Haziran 2015

1733 AMIRAHMADI, Hooshang. *The political economy
of Iran under the Qajars: society, politics and foreign
relations, 1796 to 1926*. London: Tauris, 2012 *Kaçarlar*
(International Library of Iranian Studies, 30). 111340
319 pp.

27 Haziran 2015